

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

AND

ALEXANDER GILLIES

VOLUME XXXVIII



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1943

CONTENTS

ARTICLES	PAGE
BAID, R. C., An Early Version of Middleton's 'Game at Chesse'	177
BARTLEY, J. O., The Development of a Stock Character: II. The Stage Scotsman; III. The Stage Welshman (to 1800)	279
FIEDLER, H. G., The Friendship of Thomas Carlyle and Varnhagen von Ense, with a Letter hitherto unknown	32
FLETCHER, F. T. H., Montesquieu and British Education in the Eighteenth Century	298
GLASHEEN, ADALINE E. and FRANCIS J., The Publication of 'The Wandering Jew'	11
JONES, F. L., An Unknown Poem of Leconte de Lisle: 'Une Nuit d'Orient'	217
LAIRD, CHARLTON, Palatinus Latinus 1970, a Composite Manuscript	117
LAWTON, H. W., The Confidant in and before French Classical Tragedy	18
LEWENT, K., Old Provençal Miscellany	106
LILLY, GWENETH, The Welsh Influence in the Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins	192
MACPHAIL, J. H., Blake and Switzerland	81
MCCLEAN, R. J., Some Modern Swedish Writers	236
ROTH, CECIL, The Marrano Press at Ferrara, 1552-1555	307
SELLS, IRIS E., 'Marguerite'	289
SOUSA-LEÃO, J. DE, Southey and Brazil	181
STAHL, E. L., Hölderlin and Symbolism	226
STARKIE, ENID, On the Trail of Arthur Rimbaud	206
STEIN, ARNOLD, The Second English Satirist	273
STROUT, ALAN LANG, A Study in Periodical Patchwork. John Wilson's 'Recreations of Christopher North', 1842	88
ULLMANN, STEPHEN DE, Laws of Language and Laws of Nature	328
VINOKUR, GRIGORY, Soviet Linguistics in 1942	242
WAGNER, ALBERT MALTE, Who is the Author of Lessing's 'Education of Man-kind'?	318
WALTER, J. H., Further Notes on the Alterations to the 'Faerie Queene'	1
WHITFIELD, J. H., The Anatomy of Virtue	222
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES	
ATKINS, STUART, An Early Translation from 'Hermann und Dorothea'	40
BELL, ALEXANDER, Was 'Treson' in the 'Chronicle'?	126
BUSH, DOUGLAS, Tennyson's 'Ulysses' and 'Hamlet'	38
CUNNINGHAM, W. R., The Date of the 'Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles'	250
FIEDLER, H. G., Five Rilke Letters, hitherto unpublished	132
FIEDLER, H. G., Why Goethe altered Faust's Christian Name	347
FORSTER, LEONARD, G. R. Weckherlin and the 'Choyce of a Wife'	251
GREG, W. W., The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature	249
HAUSMANN, ELISABETH, A Note on the Source of 'Peter-Schlemihl'	134
LOANE, GEORGE G., More Notes on Chapman's Plays	340
LOUGH, J., The 'Encyclopédie' in Eighteenth-Century Scotland	38
PARSONS, COLEMAN O., Walter Scott in Pandemonium	244
SIMPSON, PERCY, The Rhyming of Stressed with Unstressed Syllables in Elizabethan Verse	127
URWIN, KENNETH, The 59th English Ballade of Charles of Orleans	129
WHITELOCK, DOROTHY, Two Notes on Ælfric and Wulfstan	122

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
WRIGHT, HERBERT G., An Allusion to the Romance of 'Partonope of Blois' in the Fifteenth-Century Tale of Guiscardo and Ghismonda	340
WRIGHT, HERBERT G., The Italian Edition of Boccaccio's 'Fiammetta' used by Bartholomew Young	339
REVIEWS	
Alonso, D., La Poesía de San Juan de la Cruz (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	262
Amerbachkorrespondenz, Die, ed. by A. Hartmann, I. (F. P. PICKERING)	266
Anderson, M., R. Carpenter, R. Harris, The Bases of Artistic Creation (GWYN JONES)	156
Battenhouse, R., Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine' (U. ELLIS-FERMOR)	46
Blankenagel, J. C., The Writings of Jakob Wassermann (G. C. HOUSTON)	70
Bowra, C. M., The Heritage of Symbolism (A. CLOSS)	268
Boyd, J., Goethe's 'Iphigenie auf Tauris' (A. GILLIES)	369
Bronte, Emily Jane, The Complete Poems of, ed. by C. W. Hatfield (M. H. DODDS)	154
Butterworth, C. C., The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible (B. J. ROBERTS)	142
Chapman, G., The Poems of, ed. by P. B. Bartlett (E. C. BATHO)	355
Chrestien de Troyes, Yvain, ed. by T. B. W. Reid (B. WOLEDGE)	363
Clements, R. J., Critical Theory and Practice of the Pléiade (H. W. LAWTON)	157
de Souza, S., La Philosophie de Marcel Proust (E. STARKIE)	161
Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers, The, ed. by C. F. Buhler (G. D. WILLCOCK)	45
Ekwall, Eilert, A Philological Miscellany presented to, ed. by S. B. Liljegen and J. Melander (W. E. COLLINSON)	349
Engel, C.-E., Jean-François de Boissy (1704-1754) (F. C. ROE)	160
English Institute Annual, 1941 (J. D. COWLEY)	359
Evans, W. M., Henry Lawes (J. BUTT)	51
Foerster, N., J. McGalliard, R. Wellek, A. Warren, W. L. Schramm, Literary Scholarship (E. J. SWEETING)	59
Goethe, J. W. von, Die Leiden des jungen Werthers, ed. by E. L. Stahl (G. WATERHOUSE)	267
Goethe's Urfaust and Faust, ein Fragment, ed. by L. A. Willoughby (W. F. MAINLAND)	370
Gordon, G. S., Anglo-American Literary Relations (C. J. SISSON)	155
Gover, J. E. B., A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, The Place-Names of Middlesex (D. WHITELOCK)	44
Greg, W. W., The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare (G. I. DUTHIE)	255
Hali Meïðhad, ed. by A. F. Colborn (H. A. C. GREEN)	137
Handbook of Latin American Studies: 1939, ed. by L. Hanke and M. Burgin (E. SARMIENTO)	265
Havens, R. D., The Mind of a Poet (E. C. BATHO)	356
Hawthorne, N., The English Notebooks, ed. by R. Stewart (C. J. SISSON)	57
Higgins, M. H., and C. F. S. de Winton, Survey of Education in Portugal (H. V. LIVERMORE)	266
Johnson, S., Poems, ed. by D. Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam (G. TILLOTSON)	149
Kettler, H. K., Baroque Tradition in the Literature of the German Enlightenment, 1700-1750 (A. CLOSS)	367
Lemaitre, G., From Cubism to Surrealism in French Literature (A. L. SELLS)	64
Lewis, C. S., A Preface to Paradise Lost (Sir H. J. C. GRIERSON)	143
Lewis, C. S., Hamlet, the Prince or the Poem? (W. W. LAWRENCE)	140
London in Flames, London in Glory, ed. by R. A. Aubin (G. KITCHIN)	257
McJimsey, R. B., Chaucer's Irregular -E (S. POTTER)	138
McKillop, A. D., The Background of Thomson's Seasons (J. C. BRYCE)	258

Contents

vii

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Miller, J. R., <i>Boileau en France au dix-huitième siècle</i> (H. E. WHITTLE) . . .	364
Monod-Cassidy, H., <i>Un voyageur-philosophe au XVIII^e siècle, l'abbé Jean-Bernard Le Blanc</i> (J. LOUGH) . . .	365
Morgan, G. A., <i>What Nietzsche means</i> (W. G. MOORE) . . .	371
Morgan, W. T. and C. S., <i>A Bibliography of British History, 1700-1715, IV, V</i> (M. A. THOMSON) . . .	148
Ness, F. W., <i>The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays</i> (J. W. R. PURSER) . .	50
Nineteenth Century Studies, ed. by H. Davis, W. C. DeVane, R. C. Bald (C. J. SISSON) . . .	259
Paden, W. D., <i>Tennyson in Egypt</i> (I. E. SELLS) . . .	358
Parker, A. A., <i>The Allegorical Drama of Calderón</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . .	263
Peers, E. A., <i>Spirit of Flame</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . .	262
Peyre, H., <i>Le Classicisme français</i> (A. L. SELLS) . . .	158
Peyre, H., <i>L'Influence des Littératures antiques sur la Littérature française moderne</i> (A. L. SELLS) . . .	63
Pope, J. C., <i>The Rhythm of Beowulf</i> (J. P. OAKDEN) . . .	136
Price, L. M., <i>Christian Heinrich Schmid and his Translations of English Dramas</i> (R. PASCAL) . . .	66
Prouty, C. T., <i>George Gascoigne</i> (J. ROBERTSON) . . .	139
Rochester-Savile Letters, <i>The</i> , ed. by J. H. Wilson (G. KITCHIN) . . .	52
Roland, <i>La Chanson de</i> , ed. by F. Whitehead (B. WOLEDGE) . . .	60
Rubel, V. L., <i>Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance</i> (E. J. SWEETING) . .	354
Saylor, G. R., <i>Alphonse Daudet as a Dramatist</i> (L. W. TANCOCK) . . .	261
Silver, M., <i>Girbert de Mes, according to MS. B</i> (F. C. JOHNSON) . . .	362
Stoll, E. E., <i>Shakespeare and other Masters</i> (B. E. C. DAVIS) . . .	48
Sumberg, S. L., <i>The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival</i> (M. BEARE) . . .	366
Thrahana, ed. by K. C. Balderston (GWYN JONES) . . .	55
Tinker, C. B., and H. F. Lowry, <i>The Poetry of Matthew Arnold</i> (E. C. BATHO) .	357
Torrielli, A. J., <i>Italian Opinion on America as revealed by Italian Travelers, 1850-1900</i> (J. H. WHITFIELD) . . .	162
Trevelyan, H., <i>Goethe and the Greeks</i> (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . .	67
Tristan 'Li Bret', <i>La Grant Ystoire de Monsignor</i> , ed. by F. C. Johnson (G. HUTCHINGS) . . .	62
Vicente, Gil, <i>Tragicomedia de Don Duados</i> , ed. by D. Alonso (W. J. ENTWISTLE) .	163
Vinaver, E., <i>Hommage à Bédier</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . .	260
Walpole, H., <i>Correspondence with George Montagu</i> , ed. by W. S. Lewis and R. S. Brown, Jr. (H. WILLIAMS) . . .	53
Walz, John Albrecht, <i>Studies in Honor of</i> (E. L. STAHL) . . .	72
Weiss, R., <i>Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century</i> (J. W. H. ATKINS) . . .	353
Wellek, R., <i>The Rise of English Literary History</i> (E. J. SWEETING) . . .	359
Werner der Gartenære, <i>Meier Helmbrecht</i> , ed. by C. E. Gough (E. P. PICKERING) .	65

SHORT NOTICES

Alleman, G. S., <i>Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy</i> (G. KITCHIN) . . .	269
Balain, <i>Le Roman de</i> , ed. by M. D. Legge (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . .	270
Beys, C., <i>Les Illustres Fous</i> , ed. by M. Protzman (W. G. MOORE) . . .	169
Brunt, S., <i>A Voyage to Cacklogallinia</i> , ed. by M. Nicholson (C. J. SISSON) . .	167
Cooper, L., <i>Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature</i> (E. J. SWEETING) . .	169
Craigie, Sir W. A., <i>Some Anomalies of Spelling</i> (S. POTTER) . . .	166
Dechamps, J., <i>Memoir of Professor F. J. Tanqueray</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . .	270
<i>Essays and Studies, XXVII</i> , ed. by Nowell C. Smith (W. HUSBANDS) . . .	269

SHORT NOTICES (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Essays by Divers Hands, XIX, ed. by R. W. Chapman (W. HUSBANDS)	372
Gl' Ingannati, ed. by J. Purves (C. J. SISSON)	374
Góngora, L. de, Poesías: Polifemo, Soledades and Other Poems (W. C. ATKINSON)	75
Heredia, J.-M. de, Les Trophées (L. W. TANCOCK)	75
Herr, A. F., The Elizabethan Sermon (W. M. T. DODDS)	166
Jourdan, A., Susanna, ed. by L. M. Coffey (W. G. MOORE)	169
La Boétie, E. de, Anti-Dictator, trans. by H. Kurz (H. W. LAWTON)	74
Needler, G. H., The Lone Shieling (E. C. BATHO)	373
Phillips, W. J., France on Byron (G. KITCHIN)	168
Poe, E. A., The Raven and Other Poems, facsimile ed. by T. O. Mabbott (E. C. BATHO)	373
Polish Science and Learning, 1 (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	
Robertson, J., The Art of Letter Writing (C. J. SISSON)	373
Rostand, E., Cyrano de Bergerac, ed. by H. Ashton (F. C. ROE)	170
Sherrington, Sir C., Goethe on Nature and on Science (W. H. BRUFORD)	75
Sloane, E. H., Robert Gould, Seventeenth-Century Satirist (G. KITCHIN)	167
Sommerfelt, A., The Written and Spoken Word in Norway (R. J. MCCLEAN)	170
Stanford Studies in Language and Literature, 1941, ed. by H. Craig (W. M. T. DODDS)	372
Starr, H., Gray as a Literary Critic (E. J. SWEETING)	168
Teacher of Nations, The, ed. by J. Needham (W. G. MOORE)	374
Tickell, R., Anticipation, ed. by L. H. Butterfield (GWYN JONES)	168
Verlaine, P., Sagesse (L. W. TANCOCK)	75
Waterhouse, G., A Short History of German Literature (W. H. BRUFORD)	170
Year's Work in English Studies, The, XXI, ed. by F. S. Boas (C. J. SISSON)	165
NEW PUBLICATIONS	77, 172, 271, 375
ACCOUNTS OF THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION	79
CORRESPONDENCE (C. R. THOMPSON)	76

FURTHER NOTES ON THE ALTERATIONS TO THE
'FAERIE QUEENE'

I

In a previous article ('*The Faerie Queene: Alterations and Structure*', *M.L.R.* vol. xxxvi, no. 1, Jan. 1941, pp. 37-58), evidence was drawn from inconsistencies of story and character, from certain features common to the existing books, and from the summarized themes of Books II and III given in the letter to Raleigh, that Spenser originally used the same general plan in each of the books of the *Faerie Queene*,¹ and that the story of Britomart had been added to Books III, IV and V incorporating parts of the original version with a consequent displacing and adapting of episode and a reorientation of character and motive.² Some suggestions as to the probable course of the original main stories in Books III and IV were made.³ A more detailed and prolonged examination of Books I-VI now makes it possible to offer further suggestions as to the original versions of Books III and IV, together with some modifications of earlier suggestions, and to offer a reconstruction in outline of the writing of *The Faerie Queene* with the motives that led to changes and alterations.

Only one alteration of a previous suggestion concerns Book III. Previously it was suggested that originally Scudamour fell victim to Care from whom he was rescued by Prince Arthur.⁴ It now seems more probable that the enemy by whom Scudamour was overthrown was Malbecco representing Jealousy. In the first place, Care is not as great an enemy of love as Jealousy is; e.g.

Yet is there one more cursed then they all,
That canker-worme, that monster, Gelosie,
Which eats the hart and feedes upon the gall....

(*Hymn in Honour of Love*, 267-9)

and *The Faerie Queene*, III, c. vi, 41 and IV, c. x, 28. Again, the episode of Malbecco is obviously important with its castle setting and the lengthy genealogy of Paridel, even though Spenser writes in his letter to Raleigh that it is one of the stories 'intermedled; but rather as Accidents then intendments...'. Finally it is allegorically apt, and it bears traces of alterations implying that the original knight-patron (Scudamour) took part in it.⁵

Amoret and Florimel were probably the original twins of Book III in place of Amoret and Belpheobe. A review of their stories suggests some illuminating changes in Book IV.

¹ Op. cit. pp. 47-8.

² Ibid. p. 48.

³ Ibid. p. 42.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 40, 48.

⁵ Ibid. p. 48.

The first stanza of Book iv, c. i, begins:

Of lovers sad calamities of old
Full many piteous stories doe remaine,
But none more piteous ever was ytold
Then that of Amorets hart-binding chaine,
And this of Florimels unworthie pane.

The opposition of 'that of Amorets' and 'this of Florimels' suggests that the story of Amoret has already been completed, and that the story of Florimel is about to begin. But this is not so. It is clear from the 1590 edition that Spenser intended ending Book III with the reunion of Amoret and Scudamour. In the 1596 edition, however, he prolonged the story of Amoret and Scudamour. In doing this he introduced inconsistencies. It is in Book iv, c. i, 2-3, that we first learn that Scudamour and Amoret are man and wife, there is no hint of this in Book III even in the 1590 version;¹ moreover, Scudamour is now easily convinced of Amoret's infidelity with Britomart (iv, c. i, 46-50), although previously he thought Britomart had perished in the Castle of Busirane (III, c. xii, 45). Again, Blandamour and Scudamour fight because they are rivals for the love of Amoret (iv, c. i, 46), yet Blandamour fails completely to notice a few stanzas previously that Amoret is present (iv, c. i, 33-6). Amoret accompanies Prince Arthur from the cave of Greedy Lust and is with him when they meet Blandamour, Scudamour, Britomart, etc. (iv, c. ix, 20-2), yet Prince Arthur and the others assume that she is not present (iv, c. ix, 38). These inconsistencies support the view implied by the 1590 version that the story of Amoret and Scudamour was originally intended to end with Book III. It is possible that in its extension into Book iv, the story of Amoret and Scudamour has taken over episodes belonging to the original main story. It is possible also that episodes originally belonging to Book III have been transferred to Book iv to make room for the preliminary matter of Britomart's quest (e.g. the episode of Greedy Lust, iv, c. vii, 4 et seq.), but it is difficult to establish how far this may have occurred. The episode just referred to is allegorically sound in its present position only because Amoret and Scudamour are married, otherwise it would be misplaced after Amoret's rescue from Busirane; indeed, even though Amoret and Scudamour are married, it remains unconvincing.

Similarly, with the exception of the rescue from Proteus (iv, c. xii, 32) and the wedding tournament (v, c. iii), the active part of Florimel's story has already been told (III, c. i, 15-18; c. iv, 46-51; c. v, 1-12; c. vii, 1-36; c. viii, 20-43). However, the frequent inconsistencies attending the story of Florimel suggest that it has been altered and displaced. Thus her first appearance upsets the time relation of Marinell's defeat and her departure from the Faery Queen's court; Paridel, Satyrane and Prince Arthur all relinquish their search for her, the first-named for obvious reasons, the other two apparently just give up

¹ Nor in the letter to Raleigh. This helps to clear up the difficulties mentioned on p. 39.

without explanation or even without a statement that they have given up. Her rescue is almost an anti-climax. Again, her wedding tournament is clearly an intrusion in Book v. The story of her girdle of chastity abounds in contradictions. Unchaste women cannot wear it, yet Venus wore it; and False Florimel, while she was unable to wear it at Satyrane's tournament (iv, c. v, 16-20), had no difficulty in wearing it later (v, c. iii, 24-7); Satyrane produced it at his tournament, yet it is not clear that he had it.¹ Florimel's story, therefore, as it stands is unsatisfactorily related to the other stories in Books iii, iv and v.²

Florimel, without much doubt, represents Beauty. The close parallels between her and Amoret, the original chief female character of Book iii, have already been noted.³ Her discovery is the quest of Paridel, Satyrane and others, though these quests are dropped abruptly in Book iv. In other respects her importance is implicit: her disappearance from the court of the Faery Queene causes all the knights to search for her; Prince Arthur's interest in her is surprisingly intense; she is provided with a false counterpart whose illusory beauty is the cause of quarrels and dissensions among the knights and ladies. Indeed, the indirect evidence of the False Florimel's large share in the stories points to an equivalent importance in the true Florimel. If the original theme of Book iv were friendship, as it is now, there would be no difficulty in assigning a principal part in it to Florimel: Beauty in the Platonic view is the main beggetter of friendship.

In brief, as the story of Amoret and Scudamour seems originally to have belonged to Book iii, so the story of Florimel and her knight seems originally to have belonged to Book iv, though it is likely that an account of her birth was given in Book iii.⁴ In other words, it now seems likely not that Florimel's story has been reduced in Book iii, as previously suggested,⁵ but that it has been added to it.

The original version of Book iv is obscure, but some hints are to be obtained. The knight-patron is uncertain. It is doubtful whether Marinell occupied this position. It is likely that he was an enemy of the knight-patron, and that his Castle of the Strand was the first defensive outpost encountered by the knight in his quest. In this way his association with the sea, the element destructive of harmony, is given point. Satyrane, who wore Florimel's girdle 'as him beseemed well' (iv, c. ii, 25), and who was the virtual winner of the tournament (iv, c. v, 22), has claims for consideration. So too has Paridel, who was descended from Paris of Troy, and who with Satyrane searched for Florimel, although his subsequent history is discreditable. Amyas, who was rescued by

¹ *F.Q.A.S.* p. 45.

² *Ibid.* pp. 43, 45, 47, 49.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 48-9.

⁴ The appearance of Florimel in iii, c. i, 15, introduces difficulties. It is possible that originally the lady who appeared here was Duessa (as the False Florimel?). This would explain Britomart's attitude in st. 19 and the reference to Archimago in iii, c. iv, 45.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 47.

Arthur from Corflambo (iv, c. viii), has that rescue and his name to support his claim. On the whole, possibly Amyas has slightly the better claim. The enemy by whom the knight-patron was defeated was probably Corflambo. He has 'infectious sight' and

...most of strength and beautie his desire
Was spoyle to make, and wast them unto nought,
By casting secret flakes of lustfull fire
From his false eyes into their harts and parts entire. (iv, c. viii, 48)

He is also one of Arthur's victims, and from him and his daughter Poeana Arthur rescues Amyas. Originally the knight-patron, Amyas or another, may have been his prisoner, and the Poeana part of the story may have included elements of the Radegund story, for the Radegund episode, which as an addition to Book v,¹ lends itself readily to the view that proud beauty demands debasing tasks of its knightly victims whose strength it saps.

The allegorical centre of Book iv at present is probably the Marriage of the Thames and Medway; the Temple of Concordia is a mere antechamber to the Temple of Venus, and the latter more properly belongs to Book III, which, in spite of the account of the Gardens of Adonis, has no allegorical centre. The Marriage of the Thames and Medway, however, was originally an independent poem,² and while there is nothing to prevent its use in *The Faerie Queene*, yet it is probable that Book iv was planned without it. On the other hand, the Temple of Isis, the allegorical centre of the Britomart story, must, if the theory that the story of Britomart is an addition is sound, also be an addition, and there are some indications that this may have been transferred from Book iv.

The Temple of Isis episode has peculiarities that make it incompatible with the Britomart story and with its source, Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris*. It is strange that Britomart, the patron of Chastity, should seek spiritual refreshment at the Temple of Equity,³ and in the abrupt and unpremeditated way she does. It is strange too that the interpretation of her vision is a meagre duplication of Merlin's prophecy. It is stranger still that the Temple of Isis is dedicated to Equity at all.

Commentators are generally agreed that Spenser is indebted to Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris* in his account of the Temple of Isis and of the Temple of Venus. There are, however, other parallels which suggest that Spenser had *Isis and Osiris* closer in mind. Thus the pre-natal copulation of Argante and Ollyphant (III, c. vii, 48) finds a parallel with that of Osiris and Isis (XII); there are parallels between the Garden of Adonis (III, c. vi, 37-8, 47) and Osiris and Isis (LIII-LIV), and perhaps the strange intruding enemy in that garden, Time, may owe a little to the destructive principle Typhon (LIX), the enemy of

¹ *F.Q.A.S.* p. 52.

² Harvey, *Works*, ed. Grosart, I, 37, 38.

³ Spenser's present intention is to symbolize the right relationship between man and wife (*F.Q.A.S.* p. 51), but in so doing he has thrust upon the legend an alien interpretation.

Osiris and Isis. Plutarch's view of Isis, however, is important. He argues: ' . she has, implanted in her nature, the love for the First and Supreme of all, the which is identical with the Good. . ' (LIII).¹ And he sums up:

And to speak comprehensively, neither Water, nor Sun, nor Earth, nor Rain, is it correct to regard as Osiris or Isis; nor on the other hand, Drought, or Sea, or Fire, as Typhon; but simply whatever in these elements is either excessive or disordered in its changes, or deficiencies, to assign this to Typhon: whilst all that is well-ordered, good, and beneficial, we must regard as the *work* indeed of Isis, but as the *image, imitation, and Reason* of Osiris. If so we worship and honour them, we shall not go wrong. Nay more, we shall make Eudoxus cease from disbelieving, and being perplexed, wherefore the superintendence of love-affairs is not given to Ceres, but to Isis. . . for by one common rule we hold that these two deities are ordained to preside over the whole empire of the Good; and that all whatever exists in Nature beautiful and good, exists through their means. . . . (LXIV)

That full beauty of soul is expressed by love which is the harmonizing force of the universe is Spenser's view, whencesoever derived.² Surely then the Temple of Isis should more properly symbolize the beautiful, the good and the harmonious, and thus it would be close to the expressed theme of Book IV and might well be the temple to which the knight-patron went for spiritual refreshment.

The final enemy to be overcome was probably as at present Proteus, the sea god and incidentally the master of shapes. This again is significant, for the sea in Elizabethan view generally³ and in Spenser in particular, is the harsh, discordant element, the turbulent destroyer of harmony.⁴

Such seems to have been the original shape of Book IV.

II

Spenser introduced the story of Britomart to compliment Queen Elizabeth. Why it was necessary to add this compliment is not readily apparent, and before any motive can be suggested for it, some aspects of the stories of Arthur, Arthegal and Britomart must be considered, for they may provide indications of what has happened in the making of *The Faerie Queene*.

Prince Arthur is ignorant of his parentage, but he knows that he was taken as a baby by a faery knight and reared under the supervision of Merlin. The latter equipped him, providing, among other weapons, the diamond shield for dealing with 'monsters, raskall routes', or 'flying heavens'. He explains his coming to Faeryland in confusing terms:

For whether he, through fatal deepe foresight,
Me hither sent for cause to me unghost;
Or that fresh bleeding wound, which day and night
Whilome doth rangle in my riven breast,
With forced fury following his behest,
Me hither brought by wayes yet never found,
You to have helpt I hold my selfe yet blest.

(I, c. ix, 7)

¹ Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, trans. C. W. King.

² Cf. *Hymne in Honour of Beautie*, ll. 79-90.

³ See R. Cawley, *Unpathed Waters*, pp. 178-9.

⁴ *Colin Clout*, ll. 202-20.

However, he continues that in youth he had scorned love, but one day, tired with hunting, he lay down in the forest to sleep. In a dream 'a royal Mayd' lay beside him and made him 'goodly glee and lovely blandishment... and badd me love her deare; For dearly sure her love was to me bent'. As she left him, she said, 'She Queene of Faeries hight'. Since then Arthur has searched for her.¹

Now there is nothing impossible in this Faery Queen episode, but it is unusual. It is as if Arthur suddenly slips into a different dimension of magic and romance: the association of Merlin's grammary and prophetic utterances with Arthur is ignored at the very point we should most expect it to be displayed. By contrast, Merlin's powers are invoked to prophesy the destiny of Arthegal and Britomart, the daughter of King Ryence, Arthur's enemy.² Thus, the omission of Merlin's influence and the use of an episode savouring of Italian romance assume significance, especially when the latter is introduced by obscure phrasing.

Arthur proceeds with Guyon to the House of Temperance. Here they read two books, *Briton moniments* and the *Antiquitee of Faery lond*. Spenser prefaces the account of this with an invocation

whiles the famous auncestryes
Of my most dreaded Sovereigne I recount. (II, c. x, 1)

Then follows a chronicle of the kings of Britain from Brute to Uther Pendragon, at which point, to Arthur's disappointment, the chronicle ends after occupying sixty-nine stanzas. Thereupon follows a chronicle of the Elfes which sums up the whole genealogy beginning with Elfe and ending with Tanaquil or Gloriana (i.e. Queen Elizabeth) in seven stanzas. Spenser omits seven hundred princes because their deeds and rule were too long to record.

The inferences from these two genealogies are puzzling. Arthur apparently is one of the ancestors of Queen Elizabeth; yet Arthur and Queen Elizabeth are contemporary. The Faery Queen is Queen Elizabeth (II, Intro. 4), yet there is evidence that Arthur and Queen Elizabeth were not contemporary, and that therefore Queen Elizabeth cannot have been the Faery Queen in I, c. vii, 36, which describes what happened to Arthur's magic armour:

But, when he dyde, the Faery Queene it brought
To Faerie lond, where yet it may be seene, if sought.

The unceremonious treatment of the Elfin genealogy is noteworthy: it is scantily described and tacked as an uneasy appendage to an already overlong canto. The puzzle is not made clearer by the later genealogy, III, c. iii, 4. Again Spenser declares that he will recount

My glorious Soveraines goodly auncestrye.

This is followed (III, c. iii, 27) by an account of Arthegal, described as a son of Gorlois, together with the descendants of his marriage with Britomart. In

¹ *F.Q.* I, c. vii, 29-36; c. ix, 2-15.

² *Ibid.* III, c. ii; c. iii.

other words, Arthegal and Arthur are half-brothers, and Arthur again is not contemporary with Queen Elizabeth.

The kinship between Arthur and Arthegal is never mentioned explicitly, nor is it otherwise implied in the existing Books of *The Faerie Queene*. Spenser may, of course, have reserved announcing the relationship for a later occasion. On the other hand, there is a resemblance between the Arthegal of Books III and IV (that is, the part of Arthegal's story that was not original) and Arthur. Arthur was removed from his parents in infancy and reared by faeries. Likewise Arthegal is

sprong of seed terrestriall,
And whylome by false Faries stolne away. (III, c. iii, 26)

a statement, incidentally, surprisingly at variance with the account of his upbringing by Astraea (V, c. i). Arthur is the 'prowest man alyve' (II, c. xi, 30), and Arthegal is 'the prowest knight that ever was' (III, c. iii, 24). Arthur confesses that in his youth he despised love and lovers (I, c. ix, 10); Scudamour mocks Arthegal that he has become

a Ladies thrall,
That whylome in your minde wont to despise them all. (IV, c. vi, 28)

There is this difference, however, that while Arthur's destiny is only vaguely hinted at, Arthegal's destiny is clearly stated, yet Arthegal knows nothing of it. According to Merlin's prophetic utterances to Britomart, Arthegal is the intended ancestor of Queen Elizabeth, yet he is strangely ignorant of it. No visions in Mercilla's court, no prophecies by Merlin give him any inkling of his tremendous destiny.

While Arthegal is unaware of his destiny, Arthur seems to become more remote from his Faery Queen as he continues his quest. After his wish (III, c. iv, 54) that the Faery Queen might be as beautiful as Florimel, he does not refer explicitly to the Faery Queen again. All references in Books IV, V and VI to his quest are subdued to 'former quest', 'first enterprize', etc. (cf. IV, c. ix, 17; V, c. xi, 35; VI, c. v, 41; c. vi, 44; c. viii, 30).

III

With these peculiarities and difficulties in mind it is not easy to suggest definite answers to the questions: What changes were made to *The Faerie Queene*? Why were they made? The following account attempts to reconstruct, within limits, the making of *The Faerie Queene*.

Spenser planned *The Faerie Queene* as twelve quests undertaken by twelve knights each symbolizing a particular virtue, sent out from the Court of the Faery Queen on each of the twelve days of her annual feast. Prince Arthur was not intended to be one of the knights. Each quest occupied a single book and followed the well-defined plan which has been outlined earlier. It is possible that this plan itself has been modified and that the allegorical cores

were at first to be placed at the end of each Book.¹ But the present position of these cores and their work in strengthening the knight-patron in his weakness so that he may successfully accomplish his task is a considerable artistic gain, and may have been made for that reason as well as for others. At first Spenser may have thought of using the heroes of medieval romance as models for his knights-patron (Red Cross Knight, Guyon, and perhaps Amis), and it was this and the somewhat rigid medieval atmosphere of romance and morality play that occasioned Gabriel Harvey's censure.²

The Court of the Faery Queen and the quest of Prince Arthur for her were the themes that linked the separate Books together. It is possible that at this early stage the work was designed to glorify the House of Tudor by portraying the exploits of two of its illustrious ancestors, Prince Arthur and the Faery Queen, and that their union and offspring were prophesied by Merlin whose magic brought them together. Very soon, however, perhaps because he had incorporated much current religious history into Book I, Spenser saw tremendous possibilities in making the Faery Queen represent Queen Elizabeth. At all events he found it necessary to state clearly in the proem to Book II that the Faery Queen was meant to be Elizabeth. To make the matter even more prominent he appended the Elfin genealogy to the chronicle of British kings, and thereby Arthur and Elizabeth (Gloriana) were by inference contemporaries. By 1585, after the death of Alençon, it was evident that Elizabeth was not going to marry, but Spenser had by this time probably completed the first five Books. He was, therefore, faced with the loss of the topical significance of the marriage of the Faery Queen and Prince Arthur, a significance that he had stressed in Books I-III. Moreover, the earlier parts of the work had already circulated among friends and admirers and their course was well known.

The obvious course before Spenser was to revert to Prince Arthur and the Faery Queen as ancestors of Elizabeth, but this would lose all the topical point that had become the motif of the work, and would be very difficult to eradicate at this time. Worse still, Elizabeth, if she became aware of the change, might not construe it as a compliment. However, as matters stood, no compliment would be paid in any case. In his predicament Spenser resorted to a brilliant expedient. He created two new ancestors for Elizabeth, Arthegal and Britomart. Arthegal was already in being, all that was necessary was to introduce him far earlier in the work and create a love story for him. As wife to Arthegal Spenser created Britomart, and thus mated Justice and Chastity, a most apposite compliment to Elizabeth. To add weight and plausibility to this story he made Arthegal half-brother to Arthur, and he transferred to Britomart some of the prophecies of Merlin that had formerly belonged to Arthur. The Arthur and Faery Queen romance he subdued, sent Arthur off on his quest as the result of a casual encounter, and without any clear destiny,

¹ *F.Q.A.S.* pp. 38, 52.

² *Works*, I, 95.

and he dimmed the references to his quest in the later books. It rather looks as if he were preparing his readers for an alteration in Arthur's fortunes. Arthur might have emerged not as a single protagonist, a Leicester or an Essex, but as symbolical of a virtue only occasionally met with in individuals. If Spenser had survived Elizabeth, it may not be wildly improbable to suggest that Prince Arthur, arriving at Cleopolis too late to marry the Faery Queen, might have succeeded her as James I.

When Spenser came to alter Book iv, presumably after 1590, he was faced with further problems. Originally Florimel and Amyas, it has been suggested, were the chief figures in the Book. As the story of Britomart was going to intrude on Book iv as it had done on Book iii, the point of the parallels between Amoret and Florimel had now disappeared (indeed, Spenser supplied Amoret with another twin, Belpheobe); again the original form was extremely rigid. It is likely, therefore, that Spenser abandoned his original plan and conceived of Book iv in a new way as a bridge between iii and v. He thereupon recast the Book into a symmetrical pattern and made, at some sacrifice of narrative cohesion, a brilliantly varied allegorical study. He points out explicitly in the proem to Book iv that he is writing of love particularly that Queen Elizabeth 'may hearke to love, and reade this lesson often'. The lesson which rings through the whole book is the force of love in bringing about reconciliation and harmony: Britomart reveals her otherwise closely concealed sex for the sake of 'goodly fellowship' (iv, c. i, 15); Sir Timias is admitted again to the favour of Belpheobe (iv, c. viii); Placidus marries Poena the daughter of his enemy Corflambo (iv, c. ix, 15); 'lewd Claribell' (iv, c. ix, 20) becomes 'good Sir Claribell' (iv, c. ix, 40); Marinell obtains Florimel from Proteus by the peaceful intervention of Neptune (iv, c. xii), Triamond and Cambel are reconciled by the draught of nepenthe, and seal their friendship by marriage with Canace and Cambina (iv, c. iii, 42-52). This last story of friendship, marriage and brotherly love Spenser used as the symbol of the whole book, and named it after Cambel and Triamond. The chivalric, platonic and christian views on love and friendship are variously disposed about the structural centre of the book, the meeting of Arthegal and Britomart, and the whole forms a bridge between the hot lusts, rapes, jealousies of Book iii and the orderly union of Chastity and Justice in Book v.

Book v was adjusted to include the completion of Britomart's quest and possibly some of the topical episodes of 1587-8, but Book vi seems to have remained without alteration. It is possible that Book vi was written after 1590, and that Sir Philip Sidney and Arcadianism were fresh and apposite in Spenser's view of courtesy, though the references could hardly be described as topical.

On the whole Spenser seems to have kept his topical allegories in rough chronological order, not sufficiently, however, for us to regard *The Faerie*

10 *Further Notes on the Alterations to the 'Faerie Queene'*

Queene as an allegorical chronicle of the reign of Elizabeth. In this light the Mutability Cantos have significance. They were probably intended as the allegorical core of a further book.¹ It is clear, however, that, whether the Book was dedicated to Constancy or not, these cantos narrate allegorically the passing of the threat of change that all Englishmen dreaded in 1596, the year of Queen Elizabeth's grand climacteric.

The type of study here made has its pitfalls. I have no wish to play Bottom to *The Faerie Queene*, or to assume the rigid views on time of Friar Bacon's Brazen Head in the pleasaunce of Spenser's 'serial' Land of Faery. Yet the generalization that Elizabethan writers were careless correctors and adaptors is demonstrably true, and Spenser seems to be no exception. If, then, the above studies have helped to unravel the tangled threads of inconsistency and given a glimpse of Spenser at work, they have not been in vain.

J. H. WALTER

GRIMSBY

¹ Lewis, *Allegory of Love*, p. 353.

THE PUBLICATION OF 'THE WANDERING JEW'

We have no very good evidence as to when Shelley wrote 'The Wandering Jew'. Medwin first assigned it to the year 1807¹ and later to the winter of 1809-10.² The latter date seems more probable because it was in the summer of 1810 that Shelley sent the poem to John Ballantyne and Co. in Edinburgh. On 24 September of that year this company rejected the poem on the grounds of atheism,³ and Shelley asked that they forward the manuscript to John Stockdale,⁴ a London publisher. Whether Ballantyne never posted the manuscript or whether it was lost in the mail, we do not know. Stockdale, at least, did not receive it, for in November Shelley wrote to him, expressing surprise at the non-appearance of the manuscript and promising to write Mr Ballantyne about it.⁵ A few days later Shelley offered to send Stockdale a manuscript that he had with him at Oxford⁶ and he seems to have done so; on 2 December he wrote to the London publisher, asking him if he had two copies of the poem to forward one to its author for correction.⁷ The fate of these manuscripts remains a mystery. Shelley probably had one returned to him; Stockdale says that he never received a copy of the poem.⁸

According to Medwin, Shelley sent the poem to Campbell for his opinion. Campbell, says Medwin, found only two good lines in the poem. Medwin believed that after this adverse criticism Shelley had little regard for 'The Wandering Jew', and that 'he left it at his lodgings in Edinburgh, where it was disinterred by some correspondent of *Fraser's*⁹ . . .'. Medwin is, as we shall see, almost entirely wrong about the way in which the poem came to be published. He is wrong, too, in thinking that Shelley had little regard for the poem. Shelley's repeated attempts to get the poem into print show that he had considerable regard for it, and as late as October 1814 he had sufficient concern for its fate to write to Harriet for it.¹⁰

Mr Newman I. White believes that Shelley revised the poem after Campbell's discouraging criticism.¹¹ I believe that the poem was revised and that it was a revision that was eventually printed, but there is some evidence that the revision was done because the poem had been rejected by the Ballantyne Com-

¹ Medwin, *Memoir of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, p. 7.

² *Medwin Revised*, ed. H. Buxton Forman, p. 39.

³ Printed in *Stockdale's Budget*, 20 December 1826.

⁴ Shelley to Stockdale, 28 September 1810, Julian ed. VIII, 16: printed in *Stockdale's Budget*, 13 December 1826.

⁵ Shelley to Stockdale, 14 November 1810, Julian ed. VIII, 18: printed in *Stockdale's Budget*, 20 December 1826.

⁶ Shelley to Stockdale, 19 November 1810, Julian ed. VIII, 19: printed in *Stockdale's Budget*, 27 December 1826.

⁷ Shelley to Stockdale, 2 December 1810, Julian ed. VIII, 21: printed in *Stockdale's Budget*, 27 December 1826.

⁸ *Stockdale's Budget*, 3 January 1827.

⁹ *Medwin Revised*, p. 41.

¹⁰ Shelley to Harriet Westbrook Shelley, Julian ed. VII, 304.

¹¹ Newman I. White, *Shelley*, I, 580.

pany and because Shelley hoped that Stockdale would publish it for him. On 2 December 1810 Shelley wrote to Stockdale that there were some corrections he wished to make in the poem. The preface to the poem, as printed in *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* in 1829, is dated January 1811.¹ *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* notes that 'the preface bears internal marks of having been written after the poem. .'.² This preface may well have been one of the corrections. These facts seem to me to argue for a revision in December or January 1810-11. Any other revision must remain in the realm of conjecture. We have only Medwin's unsupported word that the poem ever was sent to Campbell, and Medwin's unsupported word is not good evidence.

It has been necessary to give this brief history of the early adventures of 'The Wandering Jew', most of which has long been common knowledge, because this history is important for what is to come; specifically, to the problem of what manuscript was used by *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* in publishing 'The Wandering Jew' in 1829, and what manuscript was used by *Fraser's Magazine* two years later.

In 1829, on 20 June, *The Edinburgh Literary Journal: or Weekly Register of Criticism and Belles Lettres* published the following notice:

There has recently been put into our hands a manuscript volume... It is a poem in four cantos, by the late poet Shelley, and entirely written in his own hand. It is entitled THE WANDERING JEW... It was composed upwards of twenty years ago, and brought by the poet to Edinburgh, which he visited about that period. It has since lain in the custody of a literary gentleman of this town, to whom it was then offered for publication.³

This notice was followed a week later by a long introduction to 'The Wandering Jew' by the editor of this periodical, and was accompanied by copious extracts from the first two cantos of the poem with summaries of the parts not included.

In the introduction the editor says very positively that the poem was given to the literary gentleman when Shelley visited Edinburgh in 1811.⁴ The 'literary gentleman' has been identified as James Ballantyne, for in 1871 Henry Glassford Bell, who edited *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* in 1829, said in an address at Glasgow that he first published 'The Wandering Jew' which had been given to him by James Ballantyne.⁵

Shelley scholars have refused to accept the simple statement that Shelley gave a manuscript of the poem to the Ballantynes in 1811, because they have been obsessed with the notion that Ballantyne's manuscript *must* have been the one Shelley sent to Edinburgh in the summer of 1810. But the account given by the *Literary Journal* is strangely circumstantial. Shelley was in Edinburgh in 1811 on the occasion of his ill-fated elopement with Harriet Westbrook. He was in need of money. Is it not highly probable that, having

¹ *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*, 27 June 1829, no. 33, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Edinburgh*, 20 June 1829, no. 32, p. 41.

⁴ *Edinburgh*, 27 June 1829, no. 33, p. 43.

⁵ *Shelley*, p. 580. The identification was made by Mr Walter G. Neale, Jr., from a biographical sketch of Bell in *Memoirs and Portraits of One Hundred Glasgow Men*, Anon. (Glasgow, 1886), I, 30.

revised the poem, Shelley should again attempt to persuade the Ballantyne company to publish it? I believe that this is what he did, for the date of the preface—January, 1811—precludes the possibility of *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* having published from the manuscript that Shelley first sent to the Ballantynes. The dedication to 'The Wandering Jew'—to Sir Francis Burdett—speaks of a radical Shelley, and Shelley was not radical in the summer of 1810.

On 4 July 1829 *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* continued the publication of the poem by printing extracts from the third and fourth cantos with synopses of the omitted passages. Some months later, on 26 December 1829, they published another section of 'The Wandering Jew' under the title of 'An Incantation Scene.—A poem Hitherto Unpublished, by Percy Bysshe [sic] Shelley'.¹ This is the incantation scene from the fourth canto of 'The Wandering Jew'. Changes were made in it to make the poem complete in itself, and the editors did not indicate that it was a part of 'The Wandering Jew'.²

'The Wandering Jew' was heard of next in *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, June 1831. The editors of *Fraser's*, elaborately unaware that the poem had been published previously, announced a 'new poem' by Percy Bysshe Shelley. The announcement consisted chiefly of an essay on Shelley as a poet. 'The Wandering Jew' was not mentioned until near the end of the essay.

The important literary curiosity, which the liberality of the gentleman into whose hands it has fallen, enables us now to lay before the public, for the first time, in a complete state, was offered for publication by Mr Shelley when quite a boy... There is a pretty, affecting passage at the end of the fourth canto...

'Tis mournful when the deadliest hate
Of friends, of fortune, and of fate
Is levelled at one fated head.³

The poem itself appeared in the July issue. On the back of the table of contents, there was the following note.

An obscure contemporary has accused us of announcing for publication Shelley's poem without proper authority.—We beg to assure him, that we have the sanction of Mrs Shelley.
O. Y.

The 'obscure contemporary' was *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*. This periodical had been annoyed by *Fraser's* lofty announcement of their intention to print the 'new poem'. *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* rushed to battle, printing on 11 June 1831, under the heading 'Literary Chit-chat and Varieties', this notice:

Fraser is going on swimmingly. The leading article purports to be an introduction to Shelley's Wandering Jew... The only passage we can make any sense of contains a misstatement and a half. 'The important literary curiosity, which the liberality of the gentle-

¹ *Edinburgh*, 26 December 1829, no. 59, pp. 425-6.

² Dobell must have been aware of the existence of 'An Incantation Scene', for he includes some lines from it in his version of 'The Wandering Jew' (*The Wandering Jew*, edited by Bertram Dobell, The Shelley Society Publications, Second Series, No. 12: London, Reeves and Turner, 1887), but he does not indicate that the lines were printed in a later issue of the magazine. Subsequent scholars and biographers have slavishly depended upon Dobell's information, for, without exception, they state that 'The Wandering Jew' was published in two issues of *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*, 27 June 1829 and 4 July 1829.

³ *Fraser's Magazine*, June 1831, III, 536.

man into whose hands it has fallen, enables us now to lay before the public, for the first time, in a complete state, was offered', &c. In the first place, the gentleman in whose hands the poem now is never authorized its publication in *Fraser*, as he considers it the property of Mrs Shelley. In the second, a full account of the poem, with all the most interesting passages, was given many months ago in the *Edinburgh Literary Journal*.¹

The magazine goes on then to accuse *Fraser's* of having borrowed from them, without acknowledgement, an ode on the late revolution in France, an imitation of Shelley, which had appeared in their columns some months before. There is no denying that this is exactly what *Fraser's* had done; *Fraser's* used this imitation in their essay on Shelley which announced 'The Wandering Jew'. The dependence of *Fraser's* upon the *Literary Journal* is further substantiated by the use in *Fraser's* introduction of an unusual phrase which had been used in *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* in their introduction to 'The Wandering Jew'—'the primitiae of such a mind...'. *Fraser's* responded to this attack with the sarcastic note about the 'obscure contemporary'.

Trivial though these journalistic bouts appear, they were leading to something really important—an explanation by *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* as to how *Fraser's Magazine* came into possession of 'The Wandering Jew'.

The careless scorn of the 'obscure contemporary' notice roused *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* to a veritable frenzy. On 9 July 1831 they grimly reviewed *Fraser's* July issue. After acknowledging that they are, indeed, the 'obscure contemporary' they went on:

The story of Shelley's poem is simply this. You remember our predecessor [Henry Glassford Bell] published a few extracts from it. The book was afterwards lent by him to a gentleman who was writing an essay on the genius of Shelley, with permission to make a few extracts. That person copied the whole poem, and transmitted it to Fraser. Upon our predecessor's remonstrance that the poem was Mrs Shelley's property, he wrote to Fraser requesting him not to print it. The bibliopole, however, or his editor, persisted.²

Here we have a refutation of Medwin's statement that the poem was disinterred by a correspondent of *Fraser's* from Shelley's lodgings in Edinburgh. But we have a great deal more. We have, if this notice is to be believed, a solution of the vexing problem of what manuscript *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* used and what manuscript *Fraser's Magazine* used. If this is correct, it means a complete upsetting of the notion that has been held since Shelley scholarship began, that the two printings of the poem were made from two distinct and differing manuscripts. That there were two manuscripts, two different versions made by Shelley himself, has always been assumed from the internal evidence offered by the two printings. At first glance, this internal evidence does seem to be diametrically opposed to the statement made by *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*. I believe, however, that I can show that this statement is wholly correct.

I have not been able to identify the editor who wrote the notice. His predecessor was Henry Glassford Bell, and it is safe to assume that the notice

¹ *Edinburgh*, 11 June 1831, no. 135, p. 51. (This is p. 51 of the advertisements; it follows p. 376 of the text.)

² *Edinburgh*, 9 July 1831, no. 139, p. 24.

originated with him. If we accept it, the story is as follows: In 1811 Shelley gave the manuscript to one of the Ballantynes; in 1829 James Ballantyne was in possession of the manuscript which he gave to Bell to publish in the newly founded *Literary Journal*; Bell subsequently lent the manuscript to a man who was writing an essay on Shelley; this man copied the poem and gave the copy to *Fraser's*. Here we have a very logical sequence of events. It is rather miraculous, when we come to think of it, that two separate and distinct versions of the poem should turn up within two years of each other, after having been lost for twenty. Furthermore, with the exception of Shelley, all the people involved in the transactions were alive in 1831. If the unknown editor's statement was false, why didn't someone deny it? *Fraser's* didn't deny it, Bell didn't, Ballantyne didn't, neither did the gentleman who gave the copy to *Fraser's*. There seems, therefore, no reason to believe that the principals in this business did not accept this explanation.

But how are we to reconcile the very marked differences between the two printed versions? There exist differences in words, in placement of lines, and there are omissions. Some of these might be explained by a copyist's errors, but not enough of them. A careful study of the differences will, however, convince the reader that these differences are not, after all, so very marked as they appear on first reading.

There is considerable disparity in the spelling, which in general is modernized from *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* to *Fraser's*; there are changes in punctuation. Both of these may be laid at the door of the editor of *Fraser's*. *Fraser's* prints headpieces to the various cantos, which naturally did not appear in *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* because this magazine did not give the poem entire, but contented itself with extracts. The long prose note which Shelley modelled on Schubart's poem is not given in *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*, but its presence in the manuscript is alluded to by the editor.¹ There are, however, more serious differences between the two printed versions.

'The Wandering Jew' is not a good poem. Unhappily, it is not a short one. *The Edinburgh Literary Journal* wisely had not attempted to print the entire poem. They chose some of the best passages and connected them with prose synopses. *Fraser's*, however, proposed to print the poem in 'a complete state'. It was too long; and it is very evident from a comparison of such passages as are printed by both periodicals that the editors of *Fraser's* deleted passages of the poem, where they could do so without breaking the thread of the narrative. It is significant that *Fraser's* can never supply a line to *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*. No line occurs in *Fraser's* that does not occur in the passages that the *Literary Journal* quotes. Let us take a number of examples to illustrate this editorial cutting by *Fraser's*.

In a passage from *The Edinburgh Literary Journal*, from the first canto, a

¹ *Edinburgh*, 4 July 1829, no. 34, p. 58.

new section begins after the line, 'And ceased her babbling call'. These lines follow immediately:

With every charm the landscape glow'd
Which partial Nature's hand bestow'd;
Nor could the mimic hand of art
Such beauties or such hues impart.¹

The next section begins: 'Light clouds, in fleeting livery gay...'. In *Fraser's Magazine* a new section starts after the words 'babbling call', and the new section begins 'Light clouds...'.²

At the end of the fourth canto (I have taken these illustrations more or less at random) we see *Fraser's* doing the same thing.

The Edinburgh Literary Journal
Ah! I have felt his burning ire,
I feel,—I feel it now,—
His flaming mark is fixed on my head,
And must remain in traces dread;
Wild anguish glooms my brow...²

Fraser's Magazine
Ah! I have felt his burning ire
Wild anguish glooms my brow...³

To give more examples of this editorial cutting would be redundant. They are to be found everywhere in the poem; sometimes only one or two lines are cut, sometimes more, but the cutting occurs only where it does not interfere with the story. The cutting is not the sort a young poet would make; many of the best lines are sacrificed, and it is impossible that in a revision Shelley could have been so consistent from one version to the other. There is a further piece of evidence to support the fact that *Fraser's* deleted. In the introduction to the poem, they quoted three lines which they said were to be found in the fourth canto of 'The Wandering Jew'. These lines do not appear in the printed poem.

If we accept the fact that *Fraser's Magazine* cut 'The Wandering Jew' before printing it, we dispose of all the differences in version in the first, second, and fourth cantos of the poem. The third canto has differences of a somewhat more complex character. This same method of deletion is the ultimate solution of the differences, but it is not quite so easy to see this on first study.

The third canto is concerned solely with the Wandering Jew's account of his sin against Christ and his subsequent torture at being unable to die. The account is very wordy and repetitive. It is little wonder that the editors of *Fraser's* wanted to cut it down. They did this partly by simple deletion, partly by a complex scrambling of lines. Here is a particularly clear example of what I mean.

The Edinburgh Literary Journal
Convulsed, all nature shook with fear,
As if the very end was near;
Earth to her centre trembled;
Rent in twain was the temple's veil,
The graves gave up their dead;
Whilst ghosts and spirits, ghastly pale...⁴

Fraser's Magazine
Convulsed, all nature shook with fear,
Earth trembled as if the end was near.
Rent was the Temple's veil in twain—
The graves gave up their dead again.⁵

¹ *Edinburgh*, 27 June 1829, no. 33, p. 44.

² *Fraser's Magazine*, July 1831, III, 677.

³ *Fraser's Magazine*, July 1831, III, 671.

⁴ *Edinburgh*, 4 July 1829, no. 34, p. 60.

⁵ *Edinburgh*, 4 July 1829, no. 34, p. 57.

Fraser's omits the line beginning 'Whilst ghosts and spirits' and the lines that follow it, and having no need for a rhyme for 'pale' changes 'Rent in twain was the temple's vail..' to 'Rent was the Temple's vail in twain...', puts the word 'again' after 'dead' to achieve a rhyme, and combines the second and third lines of the earlier publication. This successfully shortens the passage without sacrificing the meaning. This was surely no great feat on the editor's part.

Another example of the same thing is to be found a little farther along in the canto:

The Edinburgh Literary Journal

How have I long'd to plunge beneath
The mansions of repelling death!
And strove that resting place to find
Where earthly sorrows cease.
Oft, when the tempest-fiends engaged,
And the warring winds tumultuous raged,
Confounding skies with seas,
Then would I rush to the towering height
Of the gigantic Teneriffe,
Or some precipitous cliff
All in the dead of the silent night.¹

Fraser's Magazine

How have I longed to plunge beneath
The mansions of repelling death
Where earthly sorrows cease!
Oft have I rushed to the towering height
Of the gigantic Teneriffe,
Or some precipitous cliff,
All in the dead of the stormy night...²

Here *Fraser's* has omitted the third line of the passage as it was first printed. The description of the storm has been omitted and the business of rushing to a towering height brought up to the word 'oft'; but the hint of the warring elements is seen in the substitution of the word 'stormy' for 'silent' in the last line, a substitution which was necessary because the storm is mentioned again below. There are a number of passages in the third canto in which this method of deletion and rearrangement was used. I do not think it necessary to refer to all of them here.

This method and the use of direct deletion were *Fraser's* way of cutting down the poem to a reasonable length. Every substantial difference between the two printed versions of the poem may be accounted for by this explanation. No one who will study 'The Wandering Jew' with any care will refuse to accept *The Edinburgh Literary Journal's* statement that *Fraser's* printed the poem from a copy of the manuscript that Shelley gave to the literary gentleman in 1811. To accept this statement clears up the problem of the manuscripts and gives us a credible sequence of events from 1811 to 1831.

ADALINE E. GLASHEEN
FRANCIS J. GLASHEEN

DANBURY, CONN.

¹ *Edinburgh*, 4 July 1829, no. 34, p. 57.

² *Fraser's Magazine*, July 1831, III, 671.

THE CONFIDANT IN AND BEFORE FRENCH CLASSICAL TRAGEDY

When the revered George Saintsbury called the confidant 'the curse of the French stage',¹ he made a hasty judgement at once uncritical and prejudicial to subsequent inquiry. The utility personages, the *confidants anonymes*, the *personnages sans action* (as Corneille calls them²) have received scant attention in the multitude of studies dedicated to the classical French stage.³ The confidant may indeed often appear subhuman, a mere peripatetic ear, but his mere technical utility, the fact that he appeared to be necessary to a writer like Racine, the fact that he is found in a highly concentrated theatre 'wherein every person, like so many servants in a well-governed family, has...some employment and...is...necessary to the carrying-on of the plot, or at least to your understanding of it'⁴ gives him a claim, indeed a right, to be studied more closely.

Whence did he come? How did he develop? When and how did he disappear, if indeed he has disappeared? What technical device or devices did he replace and what device or devices replaced him? This article cannot pretend to answer all these questions fully or finally. Indeed, a survey shows clearly that interesting discoveries await further search, that fascinating problems await solution.

It is necessary first to discuss briefly certain of the dramatic mechanisms needed by the theatre following the classical tradition. The conventions of this type of stage-play demand devices (a) to reveal the situation at the beginning of the action; (b) to describe or narrate events off-stage during the action of the play; (c) to reveal character, sentiments, emotions, intentions, doubts, wishes, hesitations in the principal personages. The writer had at his disposal various devices for (a): the *persona protatica*,⁵ the chorus, best of all an interested personage. For (b) the messenger or herald, the chorus might suffice, but the interested personage is clearly the best means. For (c) the monologue, the address to or exchange of views with the chorus or dialogue with a confidant

¹ Prolegomena to his edition of Corneille's *Horace*, Clarendon Press, 1900, p. xxxiv. The section in which it occurs, 'The Tragedy of Corneille and Racine', was taken in part from his *Short History of French Literature*.

² *Trois Discours: De l'Utilité et des Parties du poème dramatique*.

³ By far the best treatment is that in G. le Bidois, *La vie dans la tragédie de Racine*, Paris, Gigord, 6th ed. 1929, pp. 155-75. The conventional view is well represented by the article in the *Grande Encyclopédie*, xii, 384.

⁴ Dryden, *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*.

⁵ *Aelii Donati praefatio in Andriam Terentii*: Persona autem protatica ea intelligitur, quae semel inducta in principio fabulae, in nullis deinceps fabulae partibus adhibetur. A similar definition is to be found in Donatus's treatise *De tragoedia et comoedia*, which like his commentaries is to be found in the vast majority of the extremely numerous editions of Terence in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

who might be another principal personage, a secondary character or an adventitious and purely utility personage.¹

The importance of the chorus in all three mechanisms is to be noted, as also the corollary that, as the chorus loses its importance or is modified in its functions, other means naturally assume a greater value. Moreover, as dramatists realize that the use of the interested personage is more satisfying and richer in psychological interest, the anonymous messenger or confidant will disappear. Further, the monologue proper is an unreal and dangerous device which the spectator is asked to accept, like the convention of the three-walled room in stage settings. The spectator can usually swallow more than the critic, but how many critics have swallowed the camel of the chorus and strained at the gnat of the confidant!

To begin at the beginning, one may assume that a confidant is a person in whom another person confides. Clearly a principal may confide in another principal, in a secondary personage whose relation to him is by definition or tradition one of confidence (the nurse, the counsellor, the court official and so on), or in a personage attached to him by the dramatist for that special purpose. The abused *confident anonyme* is born with the appearance of this last type of confidence. Yet a personage apparently doomed to be a mere utility character may, like Phaedra's nurse, emerge from the inferior category to advance to the front of the stage and become a principal. Indeed, the dividing lines between the categories are very flimsy and the *confident anonyme* has influential kinsmen.

Now it is generally thought that the confidant is a peculiarly or at any rate typically French product. Is this really so? Or is this impression created by the more constant and striking use of this utility personage in the French tragedies which are most commonly read and seen? Are there no confidants in ancient tragedy or in the tragedy of the Renaissance? Was there in seventeenth-century France any *social* reason to justify the extensive use of this peripatetic ear?

Let us turn to the Greeks. Aeschylus needed no confidants. His use of the chorus and of the narrator sufficed; the lyrical pronouncements of the former emphasize sufficiently the sentiments and situations which the author wishes to drive home, the latter personage suffices for the revelation of events 'off' (as in the *Persae* and the *Septem contra Thebas*). At the same time, as Egger

Let me define my terms. By a *principal* I mean a personage whose fate, actions or sufferings directly determine or are directly determined by the tragic event or situation; by *secondary* personages those who, normally possessing names and attributes known to history or legend, are necessary to the dramatic treatment of the subject and in some measure contribute to the development of the tragic event; the *utility* personage is occasionally but not normally known by name to historical or legendary tradition; he serves the author as protatic personage, narrator, messenger, confidant. He is frequently a pure invention of the dramatist and bears a name of a conventional and easily recognizable type. It will be seen that the divisions between these categories are extremely flimsy.

has remarked,¹ Aeschylus's introduction of a second personage diminishes the importance of the chorus's role if not its verbosity. When Sophocles adds a further personage, the chorus tends more and more to become a simple counsellor or spectator, 'lié à l'action, mais n'ayant plus d'influence sur elle'.² In other words, the chorus is approaching the position and functions of the *confident anonyme*.

It is with Euripides that the Greek tragedy becomes really interesting from our point of view. This 'philosophe de la scène' uses *personae protaticae*, messengers and confidants. One of the functions of the French confidant is to help in the exposition. What is the practice of Euripides? In the *Hecuba*, *Trojan Women*, *Alcestis*, *Hippolytus* and *Ion* the exposition is by supernatural *personae protaticae*,³ but in the majority of his plays it is an interested personage who expounds the situation, sometimes with the help of a utility personage or of the chorus.⁴ This, however important it may be, is not the most important nor the most typical function of the confidant. What of the revelation of character? What of the sympathetic ear? No simple confidant is to be found in certain of Euripides's tragedies: the *Trojan Women*, *Helen*, *Bacchantes*, *Alcestis*, *Phoenician Damsels*, *Suppliants*, *Madness of Hercules*, *Children of Hercules*; such confidences as take place are between principal and principal or between principal and secondary persons with active roles. In other plays, something approaching the confidant of the French type is to be found. In *Hecuba*, Agamemnon himself acts as confidant for the revelation of the past. In *Electra*, Pylades is in constant attendance upon Orestes, but is mute throughout the play. It is to be noted that his relationship to Orestes (more explicit in other plays) is a special one of confidential friend, but here he is a mere 'ear'. In the same play the Old Tutor, while possessing a special relationship to Electra and Orestes, is an informant rather than a confidant. In *Orestes*, while Menelaus (verses 356 ff.) plays confidant to Orestes, it is, of course, Pylades who is the more constant confidant (as verses 729–806), though usually (as verses 1069 ff.) he is the co-protagonist—if I may be forgiven the expression—rather than a confidant. In *Andromache*, Hermione's Nurse fulfils the moderating functions of the confidante; again the special relationship is to be noted. In *Iphigenia in Tauris*, Pylades plays the friend role, including that of the confidant. In *Hippolytus* an officer gives advice to the young hero, but the most interesting part is that of Phaedra's Nurse, in whom Phaedra unwillingly confides (with the Chorus listening-in) and who turns 'reasoner', advising Phaedra to obey Venus, while the Chorus seems to represent the lady's 'better part'. After Hippolytus's rebuff to the Nurse, Phaedra chides

¹ *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, Paris, Delaplane, 17th ed. p. 140.

² *Ibid.* p. 158.

³ Ghost of Polydore; Neptune and Minerva; Apollo and Orcus; Venus; Mercury.

⁴ E.g. *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Agamemnon and Attendant; *Medea*, Medea's Nurse and children's attendant; *Suppliants*, Aethra and chorus.

her and she pleads her special relationship. The Nurse, a typical confidante in many respects, is in reality a principal personage in a specially confidential relationship to her mistress. In *Ion*, an Old Man formerly Tutor of Erechtheus is Creusa's confidant; he seems almost to personify Creusa's suspicions of Xuthus, and later he receives confidences on the past from the lady, to whom he offers advice (verses 735-1047). In the *Madness of Hercules*, Theseus is the faithful friend.

From this rapid survey, what emerges? First, that Euripides uses principal or important secondary personages as confidants. Secondly, that he attaches to his principals certain persons who stand in special relationship to them. Thirdly, that some of the special relationships are 'anonymous' and even that (as in the *Ion*) the anonymous person's special relationship is not stressed. Fourthly, that these confidants may reveal the past or give information as well as listen to the outpourings of the principal's heart and that they frequently assume the role of *raisonneur*. In other words, many of the functions of the chorus are transferred by Euripides to individuals, either interested persons or anonymous characters who usually have some special relationship to the principals.

One more point to which I wish to return later: now and then Euripides seems to make his confidant almost a personification of some side of the principal's character (Pylades in *Orestes*, 729 ff.; the Old Man in *Ion*; whereas in *Hippolytus* it is the Chorus that assumes this function).

If in Euripides the confidant as we know him in the seventeenth century is beginning to emerge, in Seneca, the chief model of French Renaissance tragedy, we find similar devices. In three of his lyrico-dramatic poems, *Hercules Furens*, *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*, the situation is expounded by immortal *personae protatiticae*, in the rest by interested personages. No confidant role in the narrower sense is to be found in *Oedipus* or the *Phoenissae*. In the *Hercules Furens*, the friend role of Theseus is much less developed than in Euripides. In the *Troades* (verses 409 ff.) appears an Old Man who, in conversation with Andromache, extracts from her both information and sentiments; he counsels and advises her.¹ Medea's Nurse (*Medea*, verses 150-76) opposes her mistress's fury and (verses 380 ff.) attempts to calm her she is the confidante of special relationship. Seneca's *Hippolytus* has some important differences from Euripides's; Phaedra's Nurse (verses 129-273) is at first Phaedra's 'better part', but is at last overcome by her charge's threat of suicide, and while it is Phaedra herself who reveals her love to Hippolytus, it is the Nurse who conceives the plan of accusing the young man. It

¹ This personage is regarded as a remarkable importation by R. G. Moulton, *Ancient Classical Drama*, Oxford, 2nd ed. 1898, pp. 210-12. He stresses the point that in this Act (III), the chorus takes no part until the final interlude, when it deals with matter not touching the contents of the act. In other words, as the chorus deserts its function, the confidant appears.

22 *The Confidant in and before French Classical Tragedy*

should be noted that the Nurse stresses her special relationship to her lady (246-8):

Per has senectae splendidae supplex comas
fessumque curis pectus et cara ubera
precor, furorem siste teque ipsa adiuva.

In *Agamemnon*, Clytemnestra's Nurse (verses 125 ff.) is again the reasoner, seeking to restrain her mistress's rage. In *Thyestes*, the Attendant of Atreus is a reasoner. In *Hercules Oetaeus*, Deianira's Nurse at first attempts to restrain her mistress, then persuades her to try the love potion and helps in the preparation of the fatal robe, unaware of its fearsome properties and genuinely concerned to restore Hercules to his wife. On the discovery of the robe's fatal character, the Nurse tries to calm Deianira's despair and pleads by the special relationship existing between them (925-6).

Per has aniles ecce te supplex comas
atque ubera ista paene materna obsecro.

In Seneca then we find the confidant emerging still more clearly, less use being made proportionately of confidences between principals, though these are still frequent. On the other hand, the *confident anonyme* appears for a moment in the *Troades*; the Satellites of Atreus in *Thyestes* is a typical *raisonneur*, in *Medea*, in *Hippolytus*, in *Agamemnon* and in *Hercules Oetaeus* the Nurse, a person in a special relationship of confidence to the principal, is used, while in two of these plays the Nurse assumes the importance of an *active* role and, in spite of anonymity, passes from the utility class to the category of principal.

It is, of course, inevitable that the imitators of Seneca in the Renaissance should introduce some similar characters, and the imitation of Euripides, when it begins to accompany or replace that of Seneca, will not cause any important deviation. In tragedies of non-classical subject, the classical technique with few exceptions (Des Masures, for instance) will preserve its main mechanisms. A rapid glance at the chief French tragedies of the sixteenth century will illustrate the point, but will also show some further development towards the conventional confidant of the *Grand Siècle*.

Supernatural *personae protaticae* are used for the exposition in Jodelle's *Cléopâtre*, Garnier's *Porcie* and *Hippolyte*, and Montchrestien's *Lacènes*, though the exposition is sometimes, as in *Cléopâtre* and *Les Lacènes*, continued by interested personages. Exposition by interested personages is much more used—Jodelle's *Didon*, Grévin's *César*, the plays of Garnier and Montchrestien not already mentioned—though sometimes this personage has as auxiliary a character in a confidant role: in Grévin's *César*, Marc-Antoine; in Montchrestien's *Hector*, the Chorus; in his *Reine d'Écosse*, a counsellor of the Queen of England; in the *Cartaginoise*, a Nurse and a Messenger; in *Aman*, Cirus. The anonymous messenger role persists, but narrations too are now often made by interested personages: the Nurse in *Porcie* (v, 1); Philippes in

Cornélie. Garnier's *Troade* has no confidant role proper, since a state of confidence exists between most of the many principal characters. The chorus, too, persists throughout these tragedies, sometimes fulfilling a confidant role, but more often relinquishing it to play the part of a lyrico-moral commentator, when an individual confidant normally appears.

A general, if vague, line of development is to be found in these French tragedies. Jodelle surrounds his principal personages, two in each tragedy, with persons in a special relationship to them. Thus in *Cléopâtre*, the Queen has Eras and Charmium, secondary personages, having proper confidante roles, but as historical persons not the anonymous confidantes of the seventeenth century. Like Agrippa and Proculée, the counsellors of Octavien, they are known to historical tradition and they are not mere ears; they advise, console, indulge in bouts of stichomythia with their principals. Similarly, in *Didon* Jodelle has attached to Enée the figures of Ascaigne, Achate and Palinure, to Didon her sister Anne and her Nurse Barce, with similar functions. Grévin too places round his César a number of well-known historical characters, all acting more or less 'in character', Marc-Antoine among them all approaching most nearly to a confidant's role. In this play Calpurnie has a Nurse (Acts III and IV) and there is an anonymous messenger; the former is, as usual, consoler and adviser.

With Garnier we move nearer to the confidant proper, though even here it would be untrue to say that the seventeenth-century 'curse' has put in an unmistakable appearance. In *Porcie*, the Nurse appears, opposing the grief and eventually narrating the death of her mistress and herself committing suicide. There is also Arée, the philosopher, who plays the *raisonneur* with Octave (III, 1), and Ventidie, whose role is almost that of Marc-Antoine's confidant. His historical name, however, preserves him from the anonymous category and he may be considered to act 'in character'. In *Cornélie*, the Chorus (III, 1) consoles Cornélie, to whom also comes Philippes as narrator and *raisonneur*. Cassie has as a second fiddle, if not technically confidant, Décime Brute (IV, 1). *Marc-Antoine* is full of *raisonneurs*: Eras and Charmion, Diomède (Cleopatra's secretary), Lucile 'amy de Marc-Antoine', Agrippe 'amy de César'—all still in the historical secondary personage category. Phaedra's Nurse in Garnier's *Hippolyte* is undoubtedly a principal personage, as she is later in Racine's *Phèdre* and as she had already been in the plays of Euripides and Seneca. Her special relationship to her mistress is pleaded:

Par ces cheveux grisons, tesmoins de mes vieux ans,
Par ce crespé estomach, chargé de songes cuisans,
Par ce col recourbé, par ces chères mamelles,
Que vous avez pressé de vos lèvres nouvelles,
Je vous supply, mon âme...

and from the now conventional *raisonneuse* that she is at the beginning of the play she becomes an important and horrifying person. The *raisonneur* also

appears in *Antigone*. Ismène is the natural confidante of Antigone, Hémon acts the reasoner with Créon. A fleeting appearance is made by Eurydice and Dorothée, two very minor personages with parts that it would be difficult to define yet who are certainly not confidantes in the seventeenth-century sense. *Les Juives* is interesting for its introduction of the impressive figure of the Prophet as expositor, narrator and epilogue, but it is even more remarkable for its highly developed roles of *raisonneurs*. Chief of these is Nabuzardan, the adviser of Nabuchodonosor;¹ after him comes Sarrée, High Priest, a *raisonneur* by virtue of his position; still farther behind comes the 'Gouvernante de la Roynie'. This lady, who has not much to say but when she has is informant or *raisonneuse*, is frequently just an ear, and it is significant that she is no longer 'Nourrice' but 'Gouvernante', a term frequently attached to the conventional confidante of the seventeenth century. Why the change? Was the cause social: the growing custom of confiding young ladies to professional chaperones? Was it that the almost blood relationship of nurse to charge was in some way disapproved? However that may be, we have here perhaps the nearest sixteenth-century approach to the 'curse of the French stage'.

In certain respects the tragedies of Montchrestien are retrograde. In *Hector*, the Nurse of Andromache (omitted by the way from the list of 'Entreparleurs') is a moralizing comforter and *raisonneuse*, full of the *sentences* which the period loved and which are printed in quotation marks. Antenor is the traditional adviser of the hero, who says of him:

Va, mon cher Anthenor, et sur le champ aise
Les moyens d'avancer nostre iuste entreprise:
Car les sages discours de ton esprit prudent
Ont fraudé plusieurs fois maint sinistre accident. (Act III)

He also acts as messenger and narrator in Act IV. In *La Reine d'Escoce*, the Queen of England has a Counsellor who takes an active part in the weaving of the meshes round Mary Stuart, besides acting the *raisonneur*. He is more than a mere confidant, though he remains anonymous; sometimes he appears to be a personification of an attitude of mind which the Queen is striving to suppress. However, the monologues and long tirades of the piece inevitably reduce confidant roles. In *La Cartaginoise*, Sophonisbe has her Nurse as *raisonneuse*, while Masinisse has three: Lélie, Scipio and Hiempsal, all, be it noted, historical characters. *Les Lacènes* have Pantée as the *raisonneur*

¹ See Joachim Roland, *La trag. fr. au XVI^e siècle: 'Les Juives'*, Paris, Arnold, 1924, pp. 61-2: 'c'est le propre lieutenant du roi, et non un confident anonyme. De plus il remplit dans la scène où il paraît le rôle de "raisonneur", rôle imposé à la tragédie et à la comédie classiques par le goût français des leçons morales. Le raisonneur est le personnage par la bouche duquel l'auteur exprime ses propres idées et oppose aux passions des acteurs le langage de la raison et de la modération. . . . Sarrée aussi est un peu un raisonneur; sa sagesse sentencieuse rappelle à Sédécie l'inutilité des plaintes. . . . Puis Sédécie et lui expriment de sages et pieuses pensées en 7 tirades alternées, de 4 alexandrins, 7 strophes, pourrait-on dire, tant la symétrie est apparente et voulue. Sarrée fait preuve d'une piété et d'une philosophie élevées en parlant dignement de la vanité des grandeurs humaines devant Dieu' et de l'inconstance du sort. Puis il prie Dieu de prendre Sédécie et lui comme victimes expiatoires et il engage le roi à marcher avec lui au supplice.'

attached to Cléomène. In *David*, the king has Nadab in a like part. In *Aman*, the role of Cyrus is that of a real confidant, but is short and not highly developed; there are also a number of other minor personages introduced, perhaps more for variety than for essentially dramatic purposes.

By the end of the sixteenth century then it may be said that the confidant of seventeenth-century tragedy is in the wings ready to appear. The role is well established in principle, whether in the shape of the principal or important secondary personage of known name and attribute who counsels or consoles the hero or heroine, in the shape of the Nurse with her special 'blood relationship' and on the point of turning (as in *Les Juives*) into the less closely attached 'Gouvernante' or in the form of the friend, secretary, attendant or servant to whom any name may be attached.

If we jump¹ now to the plays of Corneille and Racine, we find the conventional confidant in full development. But other changes have taken place, all significant and all calling for comment. The chorus has gone (*Esther* and *Athalie* are very special cases) and the perpetual audience of the principals' tirades has vanished with it. The monologue is suspected of *invraisemblance*. The exposition is always by interested personages, as also the narrations; at any rate the *personae protaticae* and the nameless messenger have disappeared, largely, I suspect, through the influence of comedy in which supernatural expositors would be out of place. In the classical model most followed, Terence, the *persona protatica*, so far as he existed, was a freedman or home-bred slave like the Davos of the *Phormio* or an old woman and a *meretrix* like the Syra and Philotis of the *Hecyra*; in the other four extant comedies, the exposition is by persons who appear again in the play, often by principals. Similarly in French Renaissance comedy, where the slave or freedman is replaced by the lackey or female domestic who appears again in the action, frequently in an active role. Slaves like the Davos of Terence's *Andria* are already more than confidants of sorts; he was *huic rei caput* (verse 458) and one of the most interesting characters. Moreover, he and his fellows, like their progeny in Renaissance comedy, the innumerable *lacquais* and *valets*, together with the *chambrières*, descended from the *ancillae* of Latin comedy, sometimes initiate action.

But perhaps there were social reasons why the confidant should assume importance. In the sixteenth century, society was but emerging from medieval conditions. The French girl, according to her station, was either at entire

¹ Noting as we jump that Hardy, who began with tragedies with choruses, dropped them, that 'les monologues s'abrégèrent, devinrent plus rares, furent souvent placés dans la bouche de personnages secondaires ou indifférents' (E. Rigal in Petit de Julleville, *Hist. de la lang. et litt. fr.* iv, 197), and also that in Maret's *Sophoniste* 'dans la grande scène de l'entrevue entre Sophonisbe et Massinissa, les demoiselles d'honneur de la reine ont aussi le ton des nourrices de l'ancien répertoire' (idem. p. 254).

liberty or carefully guarded by her parents. I find no mention of a 'gouvernante' before Brantôme's slighting reference to them in the *Dames Galantes*, where he calls attention to their inefficacy as protectresses of their charges' virtue.¹ In the seventeenth century, however, we find the young ladies of comedy occasionally provided with chaperones. This may have been a reflexion (as comedy was claimed to be) of everyday life, while in tragedy, dealing with personages of lofty position, it was inconceivable that the princess should not be accompanied by a suite or at least by a maid-in-waiting.²

While a certain family resemblance appears to run through the whole set of confidants and confidantes in Corneille and Racine, a closer study reveals considerable variety. It has been pointed out, for instance, that in *Polyeucte* Albin is much more personal and alive than Fabian, that Stratonice has distinct individual traits. Indeed, the examination of many a conventional-looking confidant uncovers unexpected activity.

There are occasions when a personage who, by reason of his or her relationship to a principal, might be expected to remain a mere confidant steps right out of the accursed class to the forefront of the stage and to important participation in the action. The extreme instances are, of course, Burrhus and Narcisse in *Britannicus*, Oenone in *Phèdre*. One writer has well seized and expressed the point³ a tragedy of the 'classical' type, confining the maximum of action to the minimum of time, can carry no useless characters; confidants are found in the earliest French tragedies, in Corneille, Racine, Voltaire and, in different guises, in all theatres, existing principally for the revelation of the mind or soul of the principal personages, not merely for expounding the situation or bringing news. In Corneille (he goes on) the psychology of the heroes and heroines renders the confidant more or less impotent; in Racine, where the principals are weak or helpless before their passions, the minor characters may exert an influence upon them. With the whole of this argument one cannot agree, but his analysis of the importance of Narcisse and Oenone is striking and significant.⁴

¹ Ed. Flammarion, Paris, n.d. p. 87.

² Abbé d'Aubignac, *La Pratique du Théâtre*, ed. P. Martino, Paris, Champion, 1927, p. 268, says that a crowd of *souvants*, often mute, takes the place of the chorus, to be addressed by principal characters. He refers to Plutarch, *Vita Phocionis* xxviii, who narrates that an actor playing a queen at Athens refused to go on the stage without a 'suite de demoiselles accoustrées magnifiquement pour l'accompagner' (as Amyot puts it).

³ G. le Bidois, op. cit. (see above, p. 18, n. 3).

⁴ Le Bidois, op. cit. pp. 164 ff.: 'C'est cette confidente qui accule sa maîtresse au crime. Si Nérone était plus qu'à demi coupable quand commence l'action de *Britannicus*, Phèdre au début est encore innocente. La pensée seule du crime lui est affreuse, intolérable; ne meurt-elle pas rien que d'être tentée? Qui donc lui arrache ce secret qu'elle ne porte qu'avec horreur? Qui la force de mettre au jour ce mystère d'impudicité? C'est Oenone... Elle est dans cette tragédie antique le représentant du destin; née dans la plus basse condition humaine, elle représente une puissance supérieure à celles des hommes les plus élevés en dignité, la puissance du mal. Cette puissance qui était dyarchie dans la pièce de *Britannicus*, puisqu'elle se dédoublait en quelque manière au cœur de Narcisse et de Nérone, ici est monarchie, puisqu'elle n'a qu'une seule tête, Oenone. Phèdre n'est en un sens que la première de ses sujettes.'

Brunetière takes a slightly different and even more significant view of these characters.¹

But Burrhus, Narcisse and Oenone are somewhat exceptional; exceptional, however, in degree and not in kind. Their importance lies not merely in the fact that they exert influence and affect the action, but that they are in a sense projections of sides of the character of the principals to whom they are attached. Now this projection or personification is to be found not only in Racine (though chiefly in him), but also in Euripides, in Seneca, in the Renaissance tragedy and in Corneille, in spite of his description of confidants as *gens sans action* or as people who receive the secrets of their friends and console them in their woes.²

In Euripides's *Orestes*, Pylades, as we have seen, may be considered a projection of a certain side of his friend; the Old Man in *Ion* is a personification of Creusa's suspicions of Xuthus. In Seneca, Medea's Nurse, Phaedra's Nurse, Deianira's Nurse would be the 'better parts' of their mistresses, were it not that the ardour and fury of the principals renders these advisers powerless. The tragedy of the Renaissance is full of *raisonneurs* who not only speak the language of *bon sens* but sometimes seem to echo sentiments which the principals are trying to suppress or hesitations which the principals cannot or do not avow. In the plays of Corneille, the heroic wills of the principals do not entirely rule out the process of projection. Read the conversations between Chimène and Elvire in *Le Cid* (III, 3 or V, 4, for example); the process of projection is not quite complete, for Chimène still carries on within herself the struggle between her duty to her father and her duty to Rodrigue; Elvire's eloquent pleas are the reinforcement and not the sole expression of one side of Chimène's divided heart. In *Cinna*, Euphorbe is the worse side of Maxime, urging him to betray Cinna (III, 1). Fabian, in *Polyeucte*, is the calmer side of Sévère, prompting him to self-sacrifice by refraining from seeing Pauline; 'Albin serait le bon génie de Félix, si Félix était assez modeste pour écouter un conseil',³ and so forth. Without unduly straining the point, one may frequently find the confidant in Corneille playing this part, so seldom remarked and yet so important to the psychology of the play.

¹ *Les époques du théâtre français* (1636-1850), Paris, Hachette, 1901, p. 174 and note 1: 'Qu'est-ce qu'Oenone? La confidente et la nourrice de Phèdre; mais avant tout, avant que d'être elle-même, la mauvaise conscience, si je puis ainsi dire, la voix des appétits, le double criminel de la fille de Minos et de Pasiphaé. Conseillère d'erreur et de crime, c'est elle qui a empêché Phèdre de se donner la mort; elle qui la décide à se déclarer; elle encore qui se charge de dénoncer le malheureux Hippolyte à son père. C'est elle dont le dévouement prend sur soi d'accomplir tout ce que Phèdre ose à peine songer, ou plutôt, tout ce qu'il y a de mauvais et de honteux dans Phèdre, c'est elle qui l'incarne!'. Et puisque, en critiquant Racine, on trouve toujours encore à l'admirer, est-ce pour cela que, conformément à l'indication d'Euripide, il a fait d'Oenone la "nourrice" de Phèdre, afin qu'y ayant entre elle et son enfant de lait comme un lien de chair et de sang, on vit bien qu'elles ne faisaient qu'une seule personne?' (my italics). * The footnote reads: 'On remarque que Narcisse dans *Britannicus* joue précisément le même rôle qu'Oenone dans *Phèdre*. Il est "la voix" des mauvais instincts de Néron, comme Burrhus est celle du peu de nobles sentiments que conserve encore l'Empereur.'

² *Premier Discours*.

³ F. Hémon, *Cours de Littérature, Corneille*, 3rd ed. Paris, Delegrave, 'Polyeucte', p. 25.

When we turn to Racine, we find projection complete even in the 'anonymous' confidants who presumably qualify for Saintsbury's anathema. Not, certainly, in the *Thébaïde* or the *Alexandre*, but in *Andromaque*, apart from the special relationship of confidence between Oreste and Pylade, we have Phénix, Cléone and Céphise. In Act II, scene 1, Hermione hesitates as to her conduct: shall she seek reasons for abandoning the faithless Pyrrhus and accept the offer of Oreste? Cléone advises a straightforward course, regardless of 'reasons'. She is the projection into an invented person of Hermione's long-standing but recently suppressed passion for Oreste. In Act II, scene 5, Phénix debates with Pyrrhus the latter's course of action: Phénix is the projected desire of Pyrrhus for a determined stand against the supposed wiles of Andromaque. At first Pyrrhus shows the necessary determination and Phénix approves; then Pyrrhus feels once more the power of Andromaque's charm and beauty, and Phénix's approval is changed to opposition. The faithful servant becomes the *raisonneur* and, what is more, the voice of Pyrrhus's own original determination. Similarly, though not so markedly, in Act III, scene 8, when Andromaque is faced with a tragic choice, Céphise seems to embody Andromaque's instinctive wish to save Astyanax by marrying Pyrrhus.

Now let the reader peruse one of these dialogues (preferably perhaps that of Phénix and Pyrrhus), omitting the names of the speakers and imagining the dialogue as an interior conversation carried on by the principal character. It has a familiar ring to anyone acquainted with medieval literature. Now compare this interior conversation with that, for example, which Soredamors carries on within herself in lines 897-1046 of the *Cligès* of Chrestien de Troyes.¹ The movement of the two passages, Racine and Chrestien, is exactly similar: the same hesitations, questionings, false starts, oppositions, contradictions, but whereas the medieval narrative poet was able, by the traditions and conventions of his medium, to use the monologue, the seventeenth-century dramatic author is bound by his traditions and conventions to use other devices, to exteriorize the interior debate. That was the value of the confidant properly used. The psychological processes of a complex mind could be conveniently and effectively portrayed by personifying one of the dominant factors in the figure of the confidant.² It is therefore well to look, even in the least promising confidant, for some trace of this projection.

Is there any reason why this development of the confidant should take on so striking a form in France? The French vernacular literature of the Middle Ages was, in its endless variety and wide range, remarkable for the delicacy

¹ Ed. W. Foerster, Halle, Niemeyer, 1910, pp. 25-9.

² The monologue was clearly looked on with suspicion and it is to be noted that in Corneille the 'Stances du Cid' and those of Polyucte are in lyrical form. These and the famous monologue of Auguste in *Cinna* are justifiable only on the ground of the extremely intimate nature of the matters debated—so personal that it would have been even more *invraisemblable* for the personages to have discussed them with a confidant.

and sometimes the profundity of its psychological analysis. From the fairly rudimentary but powerful portrait of the type of the famous line

Rollanz est pruz e Oliviers est sages¹

and its illustration in the contrasted behaviour of the two heroes of Roncevaux, from the comic characterization, summary but penetrating, of the fabliau and the farce, it is not a change in kind but in degree to the subtle and over-subtle analyses of the *roman courtois*. The technique of such analysis developed along with the necessity for portraying characters of greater and greater complexity. It was natural that such complexity should arise in branches of literature dealing with the problems of love or of morality, and that the best available devices should be used therefore in the romance devoted to the niceties of *courtoisie* and the dramatic form devoted to the dissection of man's weakness, the *moralité*.

It is a commonplace now to see in the allegory of the *Roman de la Rose* what Langlois saw in it years ago: the decomposition of the soul of the maiden, the extraction therefrom of all the sentiments, qualities, attitudes, general and particular, that it possessed, their endowment with an independent life, a power of individual activity, the creation thus around the Rose of a whole world of personifications which perform for the symbolic flower the functions fulfilled in the heart of a girl by her varying sentiments, fears and emotions. It is, of course, an old technique, not new in France when Guillaume de Lorris employed it in so masterly a fashion, but where did the device flourish better, where was it used more successfully than in France?

The artificiality of it is obvious, its dangers manifest, yet its potentialities are immense. These same potentialities are visible, under a guise perhaps more obviously artificial, in the *moralité*, wherein Man is confronted with his own virtues and vices who struggle for the possession of his soul. Here too these virtues and vices are personified, receive a temporary independence of life and activity and are, in a sense, the primitive entities from which Racine's Burrhus, Narcisse and Oenone may be said to have evolved. Just as the characters of the *Roman de la Rose* served as instruments of analysis, so the personages of the dramatized allegory served for the dissection of the moral character of Everyman.

In some branches of literature allegory of this type was replaced at the time of the Renaissance by mythology,² which is but another mode of symbolism. By slow stages and by the intrusion of other elements, the *moralité* became the comedy of character or of manners, but its essential dramatic process survived in or found a new application in the tragedy of the *Grand Siècle*. Not that Racine would have owned, even if he had realized, the affinity of his confidants

¹ *Chanson de Roland*, verse 1093.

² P. Kohler, *Autour de Molière. L'esprit classique et la comédie*, Paris, Payot, 1925, p. 117. The whole of his treatment of the allegorical personage (pp. 114 ff.) is of great interest.

to the personages of the earlier dramatic form. Boileau would have shuddered at the very notion of a possible parallel. Yet it should be remembered that the *moralité* lingered in France till the beginning of the seventeenth century.

If there is any substance in the rapprochement here made, it illustrates not the direct indebtedness of Corneille or Racine to the allegory, narrative or dramatic, but their participation in an evolution. Literature renews itself from old roots, draws fresh life from old springs, unconsciously continuing traditions whose more primitive manifestations were lost to memory. And just as many a character of seventeenth-century comedy may be seen as issuing from a fusion of ancient classical and native medieval prototypes, so, it might seem, the confidant merges with the functions of the ancient minor character those of the personification of the medieval romance and drama.

What of tragedy after Racine? The 'Racinian' tragedy of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries continues the confidant tradition, though with more and more convention and less and less reality. The transformations which destroyed the classical tragedy in France and replaced it by the Romantic melodrama or the *pièce à thèse* caused the *confident anonyme* to vanish. It was not, however, a genuine disappearance, for the peripatetic ear is a dramatic necessity, whether it be in the shape of the ancient chorus, the faithful friend or nurse, the confidant or the old retainer. It survives, merged in a personage provided with other functions, in almost all forms of dramatic art.¹ In the modern 'straight play' it lives on in the servant or secretary, the family lawyer or the family doctor, in one guise or another. Indeed, the metamorphosis of the confidant into a less unreal creature is partly the effect of the breakdown of the *genres*, partly that of the development of the technique of the 'interested personage' who had earlier replaced the *persona protatica* and the nameless messenger. Thus, willy-nilly, modern technique is an organic development of tendencies implicit in and essential to earlier techniques now discarded.

To sum up. The 'curse of the French stage' was in reality a useful and even rich device, capable of much variety of treatment, having certain superficial functions² but able to become a projection of some particular aspect of a principal's psychological constitution and hence an instrument of enriched analysis and portraiture. The confidant has prototypes not only in Euripides and Seneca and the tragedy of the Renaissance but also in the French drama of the later Middle Ages; and he is a manifestation, in a form suitable to his time, of that delicate attention to characterization of which French literature in all ages may be proud. He has not vanished, but is still to be discerned in many a minor personage of the post-classical and even the contemporary stage.

¹ It is found, for example, in the Hindu theatre in the *viñā*, 'the accomplished but dependent companion both of men and women', just as the *vidūshaka* offers a close parallel to the classical comedy 'parasite'. A. W. Ward, article 'Drama', *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. VIII, 483.

² Such as those admirably outlined in the article of the *Grande Encyclopédie* referred to above, p. 18, n. 3.

The subject is far from exhausted. The detailed study of other plays in French, in Italian, in Spanish, is certain to add important matter to the sketch here given, perhaps to modify it considerably. The confidant should receive the attention he deserves, attention which will be amply rewarded in knowledge of the dramatic technique of some of the greatest writers for the stage.¹

H. W. LAWTON

SOUTHAMPTON

¹ Problems outstanding are the development of the confidant in Italian and Spanish theatres and, more particularly, the relation between the development of the tragic confidant and the similar character, *servante*, valet, etc., in comedy. Further light on social aspects of the *gouvernante* is also to be sought and also seventeenth-century opinions of the confidant, which seem to be very scarce.

THE FRIENDSHIP OF THOMAS CARLYLE AND VARNHAGEN VON ENSE, WITH A LETTER HITHERTO UNKNOWN

It is well known that Thomas Carlyle carried on a correspondence with Varnhagen von Ense¹ extending over many years. Varnhagen carefully kept all the letters he received from him and left them with his large collection of autographs, books and manuscripts to his niece, Ludmilla Assing, who, according to his wish, bequeathed them to the Preussische Staatsbibliothek where they are now housed in a special room.² They were first published in a German translation by Richard Preuss in *Deutsche Rundschau*, LXXI, 96 ff. and 220 ff., and were printed in the original English in *Last Words of Thomas Carlyle*, London, 1892. On the other hand, not one of Varnhagen's letters to Carlyle has so far become known, and it is generally assumed that they were destroyed either by Carlyle himself or, more likely, by his executors and heirs. One letter, however, escaped destruction and is now in my possession. It was found in the original envelope addressed to 'M. Thomas Carlyle, Esq., 5 Cheyne Row, Chelsea, London', neatly fastened to the flyleaf at the beginning of a book which on the death of Thomas Carlyle's nephew, Alexander, was sold at a public auction in London in the summer of 1932.

The correspondence opened with a letter from Carlyle dated Chelsea, 31 December 1837, in which he acknowledged the receipt of the first four volumes of Varnhagen's *Denkwürdigkeiten* which Varnhagen had sent him early in the year and which he had reviewed in the October number of the *London and Westminster Review*. The letter begins:

Will you accept, after long delay, my hearty thanks for your kind and estimable gift; which, a good many weeks ago, on returning hither out of Scotland, I found awaiting me here. The name Varnhagen von Ense was long honourably known to me; in the Book *Rahel's Gallery*,³ as in a clear mirror, I had got a glimpse of the man himself and the world he lived in; and now, behold, the mirror-image, grown a reality, had come towards me, holding out a friendly right hand in the name of one dear to both of us! Right heartily I grasp that kind hand; and say again and again, 'Be welcome, with thanks.'—It is a great, and to me a most rare pleasure in these times, to find that I agree wholly on all important matters with a Writer; that in many highest cases his views are precisely such as I should wish to have spoken. But indeed your view of Goethe being also mine, we set out as it were from a great centre of unity, and travel lovingly together towards all manner of regions.

¹ Karl August Varnhagen von Ense (1785–1858), soldier, diplomat and author of many biographical and critical works including *Goethe in den Zeugnissen der Mitlebenden*, Berlin, 1823; *Biographische Denkmale*, 5 vols., Berlin, 1824–30; *Denkwürdigkeiten und vermischte Schriften*, 4 vols. Mannheim, 1837–8, vols. v–ix, Leipzig, 1840–59. His *Tagebücher* were published after his death in 14 vols. 1861–70, his *Ausgewählte Schriften* in 19 vols. 1871–76, and his letters to Goethe and other eminent men in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xiv (1893) and in some dozen volumes by various editors.

² See *Die Varnhagen von Ensesche Sammlung in der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, verzeichnet von Ludwig Stern, Berlin, 1911.

³ *Galerie von Bildnissen aus Rahels Umgang und Briefwechsel*, 2 vols. Leipzig, 1836.

The letter ends:

With true esteem, with thanks and affectionate wishes, I subscribe myself in hopes of meeting you some time, My dear Sir,

Heartily yours

Thomas Carlyle.

In the autumn of 1840 Varnhagen sent the fifth volume of his *Denkwürdigkeiten* which then had just appeared. Writing on 7 November to thank him, Carlyle inquired: 'Did anyone ever write an adequate life of your Frederick the Great?' To which Varnhagen replied promptly by despatching to Chelsea two works by J. D. E. Preuss: *Friedrich der Große, eine Lebensgeschichte*, 4 vols. Berlin, 1832-4, and *Friedrich der Große als Schriftsteller*, 2 vols. Berlin, 1837-8. In return Carlyle, having heard from a mutual friend¹ that Varnhagen was a keen collector of autographs, sent him a number of autograph letters of eminent Englishmen, and for the next eighteen years the two men kept up an exchange of books and autographs, Varnhagen answering frequent questions on a variety of subjects and Carlyle adding explanatory notes on the margins of the autographs he sent.²

On 19 December 1842 Carlyle wrote:

Your *Denkwürdigkeiten* are again, as ever, the delightfulest reading to me. Truly, I think, were I an absolute monarch I should decree among other things, that Varnhagen von Ense be encouraged, ordered and even compelled to write and ever to continue writing Memoirs! In truth I have not for years read any writings that please me, solace and recreate me as these *Denkwürdigkeiten* do.—My own studies and struggles, totally ineffective as yet, have lain principally for a long time back in the direction of Oliver Cromwell and our great Puritan Civil War. I do not count with any certainty that I shall ever get a book out of it,³ but the meaning of this preamble was that I had an inquiry to make of you. Whether, namely, there exists in Germany any intelligent and intelligible book about the military antiquities of Gustavus Adolphus' time? Much in our Cromwell's methods of fighting remains obstinately obscure to me. I understand only that it was the German and the Swedish method; the chief officers of our Civil War, especially great multitudes of Scotch, had served in the Thirty Years' War. Often have I reflected, in gazing into military puzzles of that period: 'Would that I had Varnhagen here, the soldier and thinker, to tell me what this means!'

On 5 February 1843 Carlyle acknowledged the receipt of a number of books on military subjects. On 1 May 1843 he announced the despatch of *Past and Present*,⁴ asks a string of questions about Norse Sagas, and continues:

There was one other matter about which I have forgotten to ask you a small question. In the supplement to Creuzer's *Symbolik*⁵ there is account given of an ancient German body having been dug up from some morass, I think in the neighbourhood of Paderborn; due account of the business having been given in printed 'Transactions' or the like. The purpose of my request is, that if there was any pamphlet published about it, any paper in some society's Transactions, or other attainable article descriptive of this singular affair, you would indicate it to me. This poor Cheruscan brother man, apparently some horrible miscreant, plunged down to be tanned in peat bogs, and then to be dug up into the daylight again after 2000 years: this thing I shall never forget.

¹ Amalie Bolte (1817-91), German novelist then living in London.

² Autograph letters of Browning, Dickens, Macaulay, Tennyson, Thackeray and other English writers, all with notes in Carlyle's hand, are in the Varnhagen Collection of the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

³ Carlyle's *Life and Letters of Oliver Cromwell* appeared in 1845.

⁴ Carlyle's *Past and Present* was one of the sensations of the spring season of 1843.

⁵ Friedrich Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker*, 4 vols. Leipzig, 1810-12.

On 4 December 1843 Carlyle reported the safe arrival of another parcel of books including several of Varnhagen's own publications and a lexicon of Norse myths:

Many thanks for your kindness which never wearies! They are beautiful volumes, the outside worthy of their interior, these are your own; they stand on my shelves in a place of honour; and as I look at them or re-examine them, they shall remind me of many things. Nyerup¹ too seems an excellent work of its kind. I wanted pressingly such a lexicon for those 'Norse Mystics'. I often feel it to have been a great mistake this that we Moderns have made, in studying with such diligence mere Greek and Roman *Primordia* and living in such profound dark inattention to our own. Odin seems to me as good a divinity as Zeus, the Norse conceptions of the Universe were as well worth elaborating as some others! But Greeks and Romans, I suppose, did not found Colleges for studying the Phoenician languages and antiquities?

In the meantime Varnhagen had been trying hard to collect information about the finding of the 'ancient German body' in a North German peat-bog and at last heard of a book containing an account of it, viz. *Handbuch einer historisch-statistisch-geographischen Beschreibung des Herzogthums Oldenburg* by Ludwig Kohle, Bremen, 1824. He obtained a copy and despatched it to Carlyle on 4 February 1844; and it was in this very volume that I found the following letter, hitherto unknown:

Berlin, den 4. Februar 1844.

Hochverehrtester Freund!

Dank, innigsten Dank, für Ihren lieben Brief und die ihn begleitende reiche Sendung! Sie ist so reich, daß ich sie für den kostbarsten Beitrag zu meiner Sammlung erklären mußte, hatte ich nicht früher schon eben so werthvolle von Ihnen empfangen. Und Sie haben jedem Blatte noch den Werth, den es an sich hat, dadurch erhöht, daß Sie ihm Ihre eigne Handschrift hinzugefügt, in oft schlichten, oft ausführlichen, sinn- und geistvollen Bemerkungen, welche gleichsam die humoristisch-kritische Auslegung dieser Bildnisse werden! Wie kann ich Ihnen für alle diese Gaben genügend danken? Sie sollen wenigstens wissen, daß ich alles dankbarst anerkenne und würdige! Auch für die schönen Gaben des Herrn Lockhart² bin ich Ihnen und ihm herzlich verpflichtet, und bitte Sie ihm zu sagen, wie sehr mich seine Gute erfreut und seine gute Meinung mir schmeichelt.

Ich würde es mir nicht vergeben, auf Ihren Brief vom 4. December erst am 4. Februar zu antworten, wäre nicht ein äußerlicher Grund schuld an dieser Verzögerung. Das beifolgende Buch war mir versprochen, aber der Buchhandler wußte desselben lange nicht habhaft zu werden; vor ein paar Tagen erst empfing ich dasselbe. In ihm findet sich—Theil I, Seite 109—die authentische zuverlässige Angabe über den altgermanischen Krieger, der im Torfmoor aufgefunden worden, und über den ich früher nur Ungenügendes berichten konnte. Ein Zufall brachte mich auf die Spur, daß in diesem Buche nähere Auskunft gegeben sei, und sogleich machte ich die Jagd auf dasselbe. Meine Erwartung ist indes etwas getäuscht, denn in den beiden dicken Bänden sprechen kaum zwei Blattseiten von dem Gegenstande; daher es auch scheinen kann, als hätte ich besser gethan diese paar Seiten Ihnen nur abzuschreiben, anstatt das ganze Buch mitzuschicken; aber bei genauerem Erwagen finde ich doch angemessener, daß Sie das Buch bekommen; der Eindruck ist entschiedener und sicherer, wenn man dergleichen gedruckt und besonders auch im Zusammenhange vor sich sieht; und da das Buch einmal da ist und Ihnen—wie hoffentlich jede meiner Sendungen—franko zukommt, so schicke ich es Ihnen getrost!—

In Betreff der Bedeutung und Wichtigkeit der nordischen Studien, beziehungsweise zu den griechischen und römischen, kann ich Ihnen, hochverehrter Freund, nicht völlig beistimmen; nein, mir ist Odin nicht eben so gut wie Zeus! und wenn die Griechen keine phönizischen Schulen gegründet haben, so thaten sie darn wohl nicht gut, obwohl der Schaden für sie dabei schwerlich so groß war als der unsrige wäre, wenn wir der griechischen

¹ Rasmus Nyerup (1759–1829) became Professor of Literature at the University of Copenhagen in 1796. Among his publications is *Wörterbuch der skandinavischen Mythologie*, Kopenhagen, 1816.

² J. G. Lockhart, Walter Scott's son-in-law, author of *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott*, Edinburgh, 1838.

entbehrten. Die neuern Völker sind schon deswegen mehr auf den Inhalt der Bildung angewiesen als auf die Herkunft derselben, weil die Abstammung der Völker sich in der Mischung mehr und mehr verliert und dem Geiste der Natur sich unterordnet; aus diesem Prinzip auch nur war es möglich, daß die germanischen und nordischen Völker das Christenthum aufnahmen, das ihnen sonst fern genug stand; hatten sie aber vorher etwas von der Herterkeit und Schönheit der griechischen Bildung empfangen können, so würde jene Wohlthat noch reichere Früchte getragen haben. Wie die Vorsehung die Volkergeschicke sich hat fügen lassen, ist gewiß recht, und wir müssen damit zufrieden sein; da jedoch bei jeder Geschichtsbetrachtung sich uns unwillkürlich die Möglichkeit aufdrängt, daß es auch anders hätte kommen können, so habe ich meinersits mich nie erwehren mögen mit Wohlgefallen die Entwicklung zu verfolgen, die uns hatte werden müssen, wenn wir das Glück gehabt hätten das Christenthum rein abgesondert von seinem jüdischen Ursprung aufzunehmen; daß wir den starren hebraischen Wust, die volle orientalische Farbung und Ausdrucksweise mitbekommen, ist ein ungeheurer Schaden, an dem wir immerfort noch leiden! Das rechte Christenthum ist noch nicht erschienen, theils hat es seine jüdische Schale noch nicht los werden können, theils ist es in die mächtige römische eingekrochen, wo es zu volligem Heidenthum, zu roher Abgotterei ausgeartet ist. Ich zweifle nicht, daß es einst noch beide Schalen abwerfen wird!—

Der Inhalt Ihres vortrefflichen 'Past and Present' wird auch bei uns immer mehr die Hauptfrage des Tages, gegen welche alle andern Gegenstände in den Hintergrund treten. Aber freilich steht die Lösung noch in weiter, weiter Ferne! Ein Schwanenorden¹ kann dabei nichts helfen!—Damit Sie eine Probe sehen, wie bei uns ein junger freisinniger Edelmann jene Lebensfrage behandelt, so lege ich Ihnen zwei kleine Schriften des Herrn Friedmund von Arnim² bei, eines Sohnes der Bettina, der früher nie etwas geschrieben hat.—Die bei uns verbotene Schrift von Stahr³ über Bettina's Königsbuch wird Ihnen auch interessant sein.—

Unter den Autographen, die ich Ihnen verdanke, befindet sich ein schönes Blatt von Bulwer, der Sie fragt, was Schiller mit den 'goldnen Kindern' in der 'Fantasie an Laura' wohl gemeint haben könne. Ich habe die Stelle nachgesehen und glaube, daß er "die Thranen" damit habe bezeichnen wollen.—⁴

Leben Sie wohl, verehrtester Freund! Ich möchte noch lange weiterschreiben, aber rheumatische Schmerzen nothigen mich aufzuhören. Mit meinen Augen ist es beim Alten. Ihr edler Zuruf, Muth zu fassen und Muth zu behalten, ist mir willkommen und findet in meiner Brust eine gute Stätte! Wenn ich klage, so ist es hauptsächlich nur darüber, daß ich meine Thätigkeit gehemmt fühle. Sei die Ihrige frisch und ungestört in segenvollem Gedeihen, das ist auch mir Trost!—Mit wiederholtem Dank, in treuester Verehrung herzlichst ergeben

Ihr

Varnhagen von Ense.

Sie werden aus dem Buche ersehen, daß unser im Moor gefundener Germane kein Cherusker sondern ein Chauke ist.

¹ The Schwanenorden was founded by Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia on 24 December 1843. It was a kind of Charity Organization Society designed to include men and women of every class and confession who pledged themselves to work for improving the condition of the working classes and the poor.

² Friedmund von Arnim (1814–83), third son of Elisabeth (Bettina) von Arnim (1785–1859), the sister of Clemens Brentano and wife of Joachim (Achim) von Arnim.

³ Adolf Stahr (1805–76), best known as author of *Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Berlin, 1859, ninth ed. 1887. *Bettina und ihr Königsbuch*, Hamburg, 1843. Bettina's *Dies Buch gehört dem König*, Berlin, 1843, is like Carlyle's *Past and Present*, a passionate plea for social reforms and is addressed to King Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia. It has been reprinted in vol. VII of *Bettina von Arnims Samiliche Werke*, hrsg. von W. Oehlke, Berlin, 1920–22.

⁴ Edward Bulwer-Lytton at that time was working at translations of Schiller's poems. Having been puzzled by the line 'Und entbunden von den goldnen Kindern' in stanza xi of the poem 'Phantasie an Laura' he turned for help to Carlyle who consulted Varnhagen and forwarded his suggestion to Bulwer. Accepting it Bulwer then translated:

Of sister-kin to melancholy Woe,
Voluptuous Pleasure comes, and happy eyes
Delivered of the tears, their children, glow
Lustrous as sunbeams—and the Darkness flies!

See *The Poems and Ballads of Schiller*, translated by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Bart. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1844. Bulwer's letter to Carlyle is in the Varnhagen Collection of the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

During the next eight years Carlyle's letters to Varnhagen are mainly concerned with his work on the history of Frederick the Great. He asks for books and maps and laments that he cannot have his friend by him 'as Lexicon'. The tone of the letters grows more and more friendly, their endings progressing from 'Yours truly' or 'Always with true esteem' to 'Yours ever', 'Heartily yours', 'Yours affectionately', 'Your affectionate friend'.

In the autumn of 1852 Carlyle carried out his long-cherished plan of going to Germany to visit Frederick's battlefields and to see Varnhagen. They met in Berlin, but their high expectations of each other were somewhat disappointed. In one of his worst moods due to sleepless nights in noisy hotels and the growing conviction that he would never be able to finish his *Frederick*, Carlyle wrote to his brother on 3 October:

Varnhagen has been to me and I have returned his call, but in him is no help at all: a lively-talking, pleasant, official kind of man; I understand every word of his German, and feel with regret how little it can do for me. Poor fellow, he is years older than myself; and he has had many slaps too; for the rest a *rustiger alter Kerl* with cunning grey eyes, turn-up nose, plenty of white hair, and a dash if dandy, soldier-citizen and Sage: that is Varnhagen; and he goes to some Miss Something's soirée every night,—whither I would never follow him and don't intend to.¹

Carlyle was lionized by Berlin society and their dinner parties were a great trial to him. At one of them the conversation turned on Goethe, and one of the guests, a well-known pietist, 'turning up his eyes', lamented that Goethe should have lacked the blessings of saving faith and should not have used his great gifts in the service of the Lord! A number agreed, canting in chorus to the same tune, until they noticed that Carlyle was ominously silent, impatiently twisting his napkin and making angry faces. At last bending forward he said in halting German but a very loud voice: 'Meine Herren! Weiß denn—keiner von Ihnen—die alte Geschichte,—daß jemand die Sonne gelästert hat,—weil er seine Zigarre nicht—an ihr—hat anzünden können?'

Varnhagen recorded his impressions of Carlyle in his diary on 1 October 1852:

Besuch von Herrn Neuberg,² der gestern mit Carlyle angekommen ist und mir diesen ankündigt. Ich komme seinem Besuch zuvor und gehe zu ihm, Hôtel de l'Europe, Taubenstraße. Herzliche Bewillkommnung; er sieht seinem Bilde sehr ähnlich, hager, langer Leib, schmale doch rothe Backen. Er klagt, er jammert; er kann nichts vertragen, ist peinlich in allen Dingen, will alles bequem und schnell ausbeuten, war in Dresden nur einen Tag, will in sechs Tagen alles einern, was er hier über Friedrich den Großen erfahren kann. Er hofft noch heute durch Neubergs Sorge eine ruhige Schlafstube zu erlangen, will schreiben und sich ausruhen, morgen zu mir kommen. Das dустre Regenwetter verstimmt ihn sehr.

After his return to England Carlyle resumed his correspondence with Varnhagen, making frequent requests for information and books about

¹ *New Letters of Thomas Carlyle*, edited by Alexander Carlyle, vol. II, p. 137.

² See the article, probably by Friedrich Althaus (died in 1897 as Professor of German at University College, London), on *Carlyle and Neuberg* in *Macmillan's Magazine*, August 1884. Joseph Neuberg (1806-87), a German merchant living in Nottingham, accompanied Carlyle 'worth ten couriers' on his journey to Germany. In 1853 he translated Carlyle's lectures on *Heroes, Hero-worship and the Heroic in History*, and in 1858-66 the first four volumes of his *History of Frederick the Great*.

Frederick II which Varnhagen fulfilled as sedulously as before. The two men met once more during Carlyle's second visit to Germany in 1858. In Varnhagen's diary there is the following entry:

Besuch von Carlyle und Neuberg; gestern ist der erstere hier angekommen, begleitet von Herrn von Usedom; und morgen früh wollen sie wieder fort, nach Zorndorf, Kunersdorf, Leuthen, Liegnitz, Sorr, Mollwitz, Prag, Kolln! Carlyle sagt, sein Buch über Friedrich den Großen sei das schlechteste, verdrießlichste, muhseligste Buch, das er je geschrieben habe, gar kein Vergnügen, nur Muhe und Noth! 'Was zum Henker hatt' ich zu schaffen mit eurem Friedrich?' Seine Klagen sind sehr spaßhaft, und zum Theil ernst, es muß ihm ungeheure Arbeit gekostet haben den Mann zu verstehen, wenn er überhaupt ihn versteht! Er sagt, in England wisse man nichts von ihm, nichts von Preußen, und auch sonst von Deutschland wenig; diese Geschichten alle seien dort ganz unbekannt, obgleich man zu seiner Zeit doch etwas davon müsse gewußt haben.—Carlyle klagt, er sei noch wie sonst a bad sleeper, könne keinen Lärm vertragen, kein fremdes Bett, müsse Bettvorhänge haben u.s.w. Doch schien er gesunder und munter als das vorige Mal, auch entschlossener.¹

In the diary which Carlyle kept during his second journey to Germany, published only recently, he recorded:

Sunday, 5 September (Berlin) 1858:

Call on Varnhagen; in, a longhaired, towsie, brisk old gentleman in spencer and undress, very brisk and hearty; 'To tea tomorrow night'—'von Herzen gern, ja'; but hope better things though I thus speak! Really liked old Varnhagen, too, a little, and was glad to see him so alert.²

When in the autumn of 1858 the first two volumes of the *History of Frederick II* had appeared and Carlyle was about to despatch them to his helpful friend, he received the news of his sudden death (10 October 1858).

H. G. FIEDLER

OXFORD

¹ *Tagebucher von Varnhagen von Ense*, xiv, 369–70.

² *Thomas Carlyle; Journey to Germany. Autumn 1858*, edited by Richard Albert Edward Brooks, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1940.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

TENNYSON'S 'ULYSSES' AND 'HAMLET'

While the main personal and literary motives embodied in *Ulysses* are well known, I do not remember that any commentator has noted one small item which has some significance regarding Tennyson's state of mind. Ulysses, recoiling from his sluggish life, thinks of his subjects as a savage race 'That hoard, and sleep, and feed, and know not me', and exclaims:

How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
To rust unburnish'd, not to shine in use!
As tho' to breathe were life.

These last lines have been related to *Troilus and Cressida*, III, iii, 150-3, but there seems to be a closer resemblance to Hamlet's soliloquy (IV, iv, 32 ff.):

What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more.
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and godlike reason
To fust in us unus'd.

Ulysses's thought of his comrades who have shared joy and danger, 'One equal temper of heroic hearts' now weak in body but 'strong in will', derives of course from Homer and Dante, but it also has a kind of parallelism with Hamlet's further reflexions on his own 'cause, and will, and strength' to act, and on the example of the bold Fortinbras and his army who are risking their lives for honour's sake. Even the one clear echo, 'sleep, and feed', is enough to indicate that Tennyson, in trying to rouse himself out of sorrow and defeatist lethargy to heroic resolution, saw himself in part as a Hamlet.

DOUGLAS BUSH

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE 'ENCYCLOPÉDIE' IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SCOTLAND

The following points came to light in the course of some investigations into the collection of eighteenth-century French books in the Aberdeen University Library.

King's College¹ did not have to wait long after the publication of the last ten volumes of text of the *Encyclopédie* in 1765 for its library to be provided with the complete set by its Chancellor, James Ogilvy, 6th Earl of Findlater. The first volume of the library copy bears the inscription: 'Bibliothecae

¹ United in 1860 with Marischal College to form the present University of Aberdeen.

Collegii Regni Aberdoniensis dono dedit Jacobus Comes de Findlater & Seafield, Universitatis Cancellarius, 1767.' The Findlater family showed throughout the eighteenth century a great interest in things French. The 5th Earl of Findlater (d. 1764) had maintained strong connexions with such French Quietists as Mme Guyon in the earlier part of the century.¹ The 7th Earl, who succeeded to the title in 1770, shared his father's interest in the contemporary intellectual movement in France: in the correspondence of Horace Walpole for the year 1771 we can follow something of his movements in Paris where, in Walpole's words, he had 'come to seek wisdom from this curious school of philosophy'.²

A further example of Scottish interest in the *Encyclopédie* is furnished by the dedication of an extremely rare text-book, first published in Edinburgh, presumably in 1766, the date of the dedication. The *Nouveau recueil de pièces choisies des meilleurs auteurs français, tant en vers qu'en prose, à l'usage des écoles* was edited by a certain Arthur Masson (M.A., Marischal College, 1750), who is described on the title-page of the 1782 edition as 'Maître-ès-arts, et de Langues, ci-devant à Edimbourg, actuellement à Aberdeen'. He was also the author of at least two other text-books: *An English Spelling-book for the Use of Schools* (3rd ed. Edinburgh, 1761) and a *Collection of Prose and Verse from the Best English authors for the use of Schools* (11th ed. Edinburgh, 1788).³ His *Nouveau recueil* must have had some success, for although I have been unable to trace any other copies of it, the 1782 edition bears the words 'édition nouvelle, corrigée et augmentée'. The selection of texts is not without interest, but the main importance of the book lies in its dedication:

A

Monsieur DIDEROT
Membre de l'ACADEMIE ROYALE
de PRUSSE,
Auteur de l'ENCYCLOPEDIE, etc.

Monsieur,

Je me flatte que vous ne me sçavez pas mauvais gré de la liberté que je prens de vous présenter ce RECUEIL que j'ai fait à l'usage de mon ÉCOLE FRANÇOISE. Présent peu digne, à la vérité! Il m'est toujours bien doux d'embrasser cette première occasion de vous témoigner en public ma vive reconnaissance de toutes les bontés que vous aviez bien voulu avoir à mon égard pendant mon séjour à PARIS; sur tout en m'adressant à Messieurs D'ALEMBERT et DUCLOS, qui me firent l'honneur de se joindre à vous à donner de si favorables attestations de ma connoissance de la Langue Françoisse. Les recommandations d'Académiciens si célèbres n'ont pas manqué de m'être très utiles. Je ne puis pas mieux répondre à des marques d'approbation si distinguées, qu'en exerçant mes foibles efforts à seconder les intentions de l'ACADEMIE FRANÇOISE, et à faire connoître votre Langue jusqu'aux extrémités de ce pays septentrional.

J'ai l'honneur d'être, Monsieur, etc.

A Edimbourg, ce 8me d'Août, 1766.

¹ Cf. G. D. Henderson, *Mystics of the North-East*, Aberdeen, 1934, pp. 39 f.

² Correspondence, ed. Paget-Toynbee, VIII, 58.

³ *Studies in the History and Development of the University of Aberdeen*, ed. P. J. Anderson, Aberdeen, 1906, p. 321.

These amusingly transparent efforts of an author to sell his text-book provide interesting proof of the way in which Diderot's part in the production of the *Encyclopédie* spread his fame all over Europe, indeed 'jusqu'aux extrémités de ce pays septentrional'.

J. LOUGH

ABERDEEN

AN EARLY TRANSLATION FROM 'HERMANN UND DOROTHEA'

The standard bibliographies¹ and the various accounts of the introduction of German literature or of Goethe's works into England² are for the most part satisfactorily informative and complete. It is only too well known that Goethe was still primarily 'Author of the Sorrows of Werther'³ in the opening years of the nineteenth century. In 1799 *Herman and Dorothea* by the German von Göthe was thus reviewed:

This little work, of the celebrated author of Werther's Sorrows, is one of the most finished and elegant compositions which we have seen of late. The characters are various and original, the diction is simple and highly polished, and Mr Gothe's hexameters are smooth, though not always correctly harmonious.⁴

In the 'Account of Gothe' which appeared in *The Monthly Magazine* for 1801 it is stated succinctly that his second period 'closes with his idyllic poem, entitled, *Hermann and Dorothy*.⁵ Although a blank-verse translation by Thomas Holcroft made the work accessible to the English reading public this same year, its very nature as idyll kept it from enjoying a success in any way comparable to that of *Werther*. Goethe's classical plasticity and the calm richness in *Hermann und Dorothea* had no contemporary appeal, nor was the form appropriate to the expression of the ideas found in Wordsworth's heroic sonnets, with their almost slogan-like directness.

Hermann und Dorothea is not, however, all clarity and calm, finish and elegance; it contains among other things an account of the effects of nationalistic revolution, perhaps dispassionate, certainly not sympathetic. The menace of France did not seem to be lessened when, in 1802, Napoleon had himself made consul for life. It was in this momentous year that there was submitted to the *Annual Register* the full translation of a passage in *Hermann und Dorothea*

¹ Goedeke, *Grundriss*, iv (2-4), 3rd ed.; B. Q. Morgan, *A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation*, 1938; J. M. Carré, *Bibliographie de Goethe en Angleterre*, Paris, 1920.

² V. Stockley, *German Literature as Known in England 1750-1830*, London, 1929; F. W. Stokoe, *German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1818*, London, 1926; J. M. Carré, *Goethe en Angleterre*, Paris, 1920—reviewed and supplemented by A. E. Turner, *M.L.R.* xvi (1921), 364 ff.

³ 'Anecdotes of German Authors and Authoresses residing at Weimar in Saxony' (running title: Account of Göthe, Author of the Sorrows of Werther), *The Monthly Magazine*, London, 1801, xi, 40 ff.

⁴ *The Monthly Magazine: Part II. For 1799* (London, 1800), p. 1084.

⁵ Cf. note 3 (quotation from p. 42).

which Holcroft¹ had seen fit to abridge (4. Gesang, Euterpe, Mutter und Sohn, ll 71–101):

Speech of the Host's Son in Herman and Dorothea. From the German.
(Original)

—When thus
Rephed the noble youth, collected firm
In virtue's dignity—
‘That man indeed
Were base and heartless, whose obdurate breast
Were steel'd against his fellow-creatures' wrongs, 5
In these tempestuous times.—Senseless the wretch
That for the welfare of his father's land
Feels not, his anxious passions watch alarm'd—
For me the actings and the sight to-day
Lay hold upon my soul—I walk'd abroad, 10
And o'er the spacious plains beheld,
Cluster'd with vines, the terminating hills;
The sunny corn-field waved its granary
Ripeness, that woo'd the sickle—and the trees
Held out their loaded arms, with promise fair 15
Of fruitful treasure for the harvest store.
But woe to fruitful fields and peaceful plains,
The spoiler is at hand—True, the broad Rhine
Protects us with his flood—but what are floods,
Or mountains, to the dreadful enemy— 20
Whose coming is a whirlwind—Old and young
The people rise—to battle thousands rush
On thousands to resist th' invading foe,
Reckless of death and danger—fits it now
A German quietly to rest at home, 25
Or hope the general danger to escape?—
Believe me, mother, I am griev'd to find,
In the last levy of our gallant townsmen,
My name exempt—true I'm your only son;
The custom of our house is flourishing, 30
Our trade extensive—but in such an hour,
Oh, were it better tamely waiting here,
A robber's yoke, a tyrant's confiscation,
Than nobly fighting in the public cause,
To guard our native borders?—Yes, my spirit 35
Informs me of the power, and gives the will
To live or perish for my country's sake;
That brave example I will teach to others.—
Oh! could the flower of German gallantly[!],
Our youth, assembled on our fair frontiers, 40
Uphold an oath, that never hostile foot
Should tread unpunish'd on our fertile fields,
Then should no proud destroyer ever spoil
Our land beneath the ruin'd owner's eyes!’

The editor of the *Annual Register* appends a note:

The above is a translation from the *Herman and Dorothea* of Goëthé, one of the most popular productions of the present day in Germany. It is valuable as it expresses, in nervous

¹ For an account and estimate of Holcroft's translation, see Stockley, op. cit. pp. 151 f., 308; for his life and political ideas, see *D.N.B.* ix, 1010–13, E. Colby's introduction to *The Life of Thomas Holcroft Written by Himself* (London, 1925, 2 vols.), and G. Herzfeld, 'Goethe und Holcroft', *Archiv*, cxlvi, 116–19 (1923).

and poetical language, the horror of the ravages of the French invaders, throughout the desolated country on the banks of the Rhine! What Herman (whose speech it is) wishes should be done in Germany, is actually the case in England at this moment.¹

Comparison of this translation with the original German reveals only one clear instance of failure to understand the text: *sie* (l. 84) is not referred back to its proper antecedent, *Volke* (l. 83), but construed with *die Jugend, Wie das Alter* (ll. 84 f.), while *rufen zusammen* (l. 84) is taken to mean 'rise' (call each other together, rush together?); the result is the heroic resistance of invasion in ll. 21-4 of the translation. Even though the translator reads the passage with England's immediate danger ever-present in his mind, he does not sacrifice epic fullness to the dramatic clarity of ideological writing. A few of the same lines in Holcroft's version afford a suggestive contrast:

And, self-collected, Herman soon reply'd:
Is there a heart so dead to human woes,
As not to weep in times like these: What man
Can say he's safe? Who bleeds not, when the land
He loves is delug'd in her children's blood? 5
This morning's sight lay heavy on my soul;
And forth I came, and view'd these noble heights;
These lordly fields, encumbered with their fruits:
This day we call them ours; but whose the next?
The foe is at our door!² 10

Holcroft compresses ten and a half hexameter lines into nine and a half iambic pentameters, while the anonymous contributor to the *Annual Register* needs seventeen iambic lines. Only Holcroft has the land 'delug'd in her children's blood' and the series of rhetorical questions leading up to the interpolation at the end of line 9.

If this fragmentary translation from *Hermann und Dorothea* were free of error, one might be tempted to attribute it to Joseph Mellish, who is known to have done an English version apparently no longer extant.³ Whatever similarities there may be between these pentameters and those of Mellish's *Maria Stuart*,⁴ they probably derive from the blank-verse tradition of British drama. It is extremely likely that Mellish used hexameters, for he preserved the original metre of Goethe's *Paläophron und Neoterpe* when he translated it (iambic trimeter).

William Taylor employed hexameters in translating passages from *Hermann und Dorothea* for his *Historical Survey*, the verse form afterwards used by the majority of translators. William Howitt, in his work *The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany* (London 1842, chap. iv), has thirty-one lines, beginning:

¹ *Annual Register for the Year 1802* (London, 1803), pp. 837-8.

² London, 1801, p. 60.

³ Cf. Goedeke, op. cit. iv (3), 341 f.; Stockley, op. cit. pp. 154 f.

⁴ Schiller, *Works* (Standard Library Edition), London, 1872. (The liberal use of the dash in Act II, Scenes 6 and 8, for instance, produces the same but not unique sort of printed page.)

'So traversed she nimbly the long and the twofold courtyard through.'¹ One such line could easily have inspired Tennyson's distichs:

These lame hexameters the strong-wing'd music of Homer!
 No—but a most burlesque barbarous experiment.
 When was a harsher sound ever heard, ye Muses, in England?
 When did a frog coarser croak upon our Helicon?
 Hexameters no worse than daring Germany gave us,
 Barbarous experiment, barbarous hexameters.

An evaluation of the various translations may be found in Prof. B. Q. Morgan's *Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation*. Entry 2864 refers to a manuscript in the Priebisch-Closs Library. Dr August Closs, who is head of the department of German at the University of Bristol, has very kindly given me permission to print a translation of Euterpe 71–82, which he copied from the manuscript:²

Then the excellent youth collected himself and made answer:
 'Really he must have a bosom of brass and no heart in't
 That in these sad days feels not the distress of the exiles;
 Nor has he sense in his head that has no concern for his welfare,
 That concerns not himself for his fatherland and her fortune.
 Sorely my heart has been touched this day with seeing and hearing.
 Now from here I look at the wide and glorious landscape
 Rolling itself in plains and billowy hillocks around us;
 Look at the golden grain that bends saluting the reaper
 And the abundant fruits that promise to plenish the storerooms.
 But alas! How near is the enemy. True that the Rhine stream
 Guards us all with its floods. But what are floods now and mountains....'

As a translation and in its versification this rendering would seem to rank among the better English versions of *Hermann und Dorothea*, always assuming this selection to be characteristic.

STUART ATKINS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

¹ Vierter Gesang, Euterpe. Mutter und Sohn, l. 8.

² He dates the manuscript '1860–70(?)'.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The January number of the *Modern Language Review* has been reduced as a precautionary measure, upon the incidence of restrictions in paper supply. Economies in layout and paper have been planned, however, to take effect in future numbers. It is expected, as a result, that the journal will continue to appear quarterly upon a more normal scale. Contributors are requested to forego the usual offprints of reviews. Offprints of articles will be supplied, however, upon request from contributors. The General Editor wishes to acknowledge gratefully the many expressions of goodwill received from sympathisers at home and abroad, especially from the United States of America.

C. J. Sisson, *Editor*.

REVIEWS

The Place-names of Middlesex. Edited by J. E. B. GOVER, ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-name Society, vol. XVIII.) Cambridge: University Press. xxxiv+237 pp. 18s.

As war circumstances have forced the Place-name Society to modify its original plan of publishing together the place-names of the City of London and those of the County of Middlesex, the present volume is confined to the county and is briefer than its predecessors. It includes, however, a considerable part of London and so the proportion of space given to street-names is high. Much information on these is brought together that could be collected only with difficulty elsewhere. They have associations with all periods of London's history. Noteworthy are certain corruptions due to popular etymology, such as Leather Street which hides the name of an Anglo-Saxon lady, *Lēofrūn* (p. 119), or Torments Hill, a lost by-form of St Ermin's Hill (p. 182).

The investigation deals a death-blow to some picturesque legends: it shows that there is no evidence to connect Gunnersbury with King Canute's niece Gunhilda, nor Charing Cross with the *chère reine* Eleanor, and that the surname of St Clement Danes cannot be explained with reference to a specific event. An earlier attempt than Stow's to account for this last name should be noted. The *Vita et Passio Walderi*, in a strange legend which makes Siward slay Earl Tostig on a bridge near Westminster, claims that Tostig and his followers were buried *in territorio quodam prope Londonias; et in memoriam rei sic gestae constructa fuit ibi ecclesia quaedam, quae Ecclesia Dacorum appellata est usque in hodiernum diem*. This is usually assumed to refer to St Clement Danes. (See C. E. Wright, *The Cultivation of Saga in Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 131 ff., 269).

The loss of such associations is compensated for with interesting information revealed by other names. The more outstanding are mentioned in the introduction, chief among them being the identification of the *Clæighangra* of annal 1016 of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; other features of interest include an occurrence of the name *Horsa* to support previous place-name evidence that this was an actual name of the migration period, and not fictitious; a *wargemere*, 'felon's mere', in Fulham (p. 202) which suggests execution by drowning and thus supports an Old English charter of 963-75 (A. J. Robertson, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. xxxvii) which refers to the execution of a woman by this means at London Bridge; and two names, Mapesbury House and *Mapes lane* (p. 164), probably derived from Walter Map.

As usual, contributions are made to our knowledge of vocabulary. Astham may contain the obscure Old English *ætsteall*, hitherto recorded three times, but unfortunately the place has no pronounced topographical feature that would help us to ascertain the precise meaning of this term. Not listed in the index on p. 225, but nevertheless of lexicographical interest are the following: *hopping* 1540, 'place where hops grow' (p. 127); *dossere*, 'a pedlar' (p. 202); *milkwife* 1543, of which *N.E.D.* knows only one other instance (p. 217); *garboil* (p. 80), instanced in 1408 and *hornbeam* (p. 78) in 1441, whereas the earliest

recording of these words in *N.E.D.* is 1548 and 1577 respectively. It is perhaps worth suggesting that in Bayswater, which according to Tanner occurred as *Bayards Watering Place* in 1380, we have the name given to Charlemagne's horse in the romances, used, as frequently in the fourteenth century, as a common noun for horse; as, for example, in *Piers Plowman* (B. vi, 196): *þat was bake for Bayarde was bote for many hungry*.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK

OXFORD

The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers. Edited by CURT F. BÜHLER. (Early English Text Society. No. 211.) London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1942. lxviii + 408 pp. 30s.

The title and spelling *Dicts* are intended to distinguish economically this publication from the *Dictes*, translated by Earl Rivers from the same French original and printed by Caxton in 1477. What we have here are hitherto unprinted Englishings of Tignonville's *Dits Moreaulx* by Stephen Scrope (corrected by William Worcester) and an anonymous translator (the Helmingham Hall version). In Appendix A is printed an abbreviated Scrope version. Of six known translators, three had some connection with Sir John Fastolf; Scrope combined the relationship of stepson with some sort of literary or clerical retainership; Worcester was Fastolf's secretary and may have been Scrope's literary executor; Rivers' traceable connection was mainly litigious.

The *genre* to which the subject-matter of the *Dicts* belongs—the 'treasury' of wise saws and ancient instances—represents to most people's thinking one of the drearier activities of the medieval mind. Yet the persistence and diffusion of this collection from Arabic through Spanish and Latin to French and English and the proliferation into numerous manuscripts and abridgements is a fact of real importance for the understanding of the background of letters, particularly, perhaps, in the latest medieval phases. As soon as the collection reached French vernacular form in the fourteenth century, it seemed to enjoy, as the surviving manuscripts, translations and derivatives show, a sort of Indian summer before the coming of Humanism. From compilation to compiling sums up the life-history of this kind of stuff, but it was clearly in its day useful clerkly apparatus.

The Introduction is, in the main, bibliographical. Dr Bühler brings to bear on the interrelation of manuscripts and versions his strenuous erudition in the fifteenth-century field. His points are established with careful and lucid scholarship and are based on what must have been laborious investigations of a considerable range of manuscripts and versions. The philological sections usual in the editions of this series are here omitted on the grounds of lateness of the texts and the impossibility of getting behind scribe to author. Whatever may be the case as to phonology and grammar, texts of this type and date have marked lexicographical importance. The Scrope-Worcester-Helmingham-Rivers versions of the *Dits*, where the common French original serves as a kind of 'control', illustrate excellently characteristic late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century processes of 'corruption' of the language—as it appeared to mid-Tudor purists. Moreover, the Scrope-Worcester (and possibly the

Helmingham) versions exemplify (what Puttenham noted) the responsibility of the secretarial class or type for this 'corruption'. The word is not, indeed, too strong for some of the wanton Gallicizings. Worcester's interpolations (distinguished in the collation-notes by heavy type) contain also some interesting linguistic pointers to what was felt to be inadequate or obscure. Though no discussion of this is included, Dr Buhler has found an economical method in his glossary, by which the reader may assess for himself some of the lexicographical interest of these texts. He prints with an asterisk words, forms and usages not in the *O.E.D.* or earlier than the first examples there recorded. In such cases the dates of the *O.E.D.* first recordings are added in brackets. Mere variants or nonce-words make up a proportion of these words, but there remain a striking number which antedate their 'first appearance' in the *O.E.D.* by a generation and in some cases by fifty to a hundred years.

The book observes the principles of editing usual among responsible but not crabbed editors. Familiar and unambiguous contractions are expanded, but not the scribal flourish over final consonants, as there is evidence that in texts of this date it was ceasing to be functional. The punctuation, we are warned, is 'truly editorial'. A fully modern usage has not been imposed, but an order of punctuation adapted to break up the scribes' frequent breathless welters into assimilable units. This matter of punctuation, in prose more than verse of this period, imposes a difficult choice upon the would-be faithful editor of a manuscript text. The twentieth-century reader cannot be expected to offer the same laborious co-operation as his fifteenth-century predecessor; in days of the making of many books the physical strain upon eyesight and attention would be intolerable. Yet this very consideration opens up to us a view of the interest of pointing in the time of transition between manuscript and printed book, when the compositors were about to take the matter in hand. Visible punctuation is, or has become, a part of our linguistic apparatus, and the history of the language seems to show that the literary mind, at least, of the later Middle Ages was becoming more punctuation-conscious, however blank the scribal page might remain in this respect. The editor has doubtless been well-advised to consider his modern reader, but it would have been interesting to have two or three representative pages with scribal punctuation for purposes of general comparison and as a reminder of the reading and thinking habits indicated by scribal practices. But, immediately upon saying this, the reviewer recalls the 408 pages of text, several intricate discussions in the Introduction and the enlightened glossary, and withdraws what may seem a carping suggestion.

G. D. WILLCOCK

LONDON

Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine'. A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy. By ROY BATTENHOUSE. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press. 1941. 266 pp.

This is one of those studies, fortunately becoming frequent, which seek to throw light on the earlier periods of literature by examining special aspects of the background of thought to which they are related: political, social, reli-

gious, philosophic, scientific or pseudo-scientific. These investigations can be of great value, for only by their means can we be made fully aware of material which should form a valuable part of our knowledge of the experience by which the mind of any given writer may have grown. When Mr Battenhouse, who is a theologian as well as an English scholar, pleads for 'a map of the intellectual situation' as a preliminary to the study of Marlowe's thought, we are in full agreement with him.

Four chapters on the background of *Tamburlaine* sum up, with additions of the author's, the conclusions of recent scholarship on the Elizabethan view of religion, atheism, fate, fortune, providence, retribution and the moral function of poetry. These are followed by special studies of the religion of Raleigh and of Chapman and lead to a series of eight chapters which examine *Tamburlaine* in the light of the material thus collected. Mr Battenhouse adds to our list of Marlowe's historical sources, shows reason for extending Spenser's influence on Marlowe to cover content and idea as well as phrasing, brings out clearly the special relationship between *Tamburlaine* and Seneca's two *Hercules* plays and makes some interesting inferences. He also traces the many general likenesses to Machiavelli's *Prince* (though it does not seem to have occurred to him to examine the *Discorsi*, which have many others, equally interesting and as provocatively general). In analysing *Tamburlaine*'s humour and passions he relates Marlowe's portrait to some contemporary psycho-physiological theories of choler, instancing that same Timothy Bright whose interpretation of melancholy J. Dover Wilson has already related to Shakespeare's portrait of Hamlet.

Unlike many former critics, Battenhouse considers the play 'a moralized history after the pattern of the *Mirror for Magistrates*' (p. 16), and the career of *Tamburlaine* intended to display 'the theme of man's faulty passions and God's just providence'. This disposes (probably deservedly) of interpretations that rely too closely on 'a nineteenth-century notion of tragedy', and relates the play rather to the Renaissance notion 'that tragedy deals with the fall (not the falling short) of men, and that the tragic fall is both a consequence and a punishment of sin' (p. 17). It also disposes (perhaps less deservedly) of modern interpretations 'based on the notion that the play is an autobiographical document of Marlowe's romantic revolt against orthodoxy'.

Many scholars have, during the last twenty years, concerned themselves with this aspect of Marlowe's work without necessarily attempting 'to abolish the distinction between drama and autobiography'. Briefly, the position is, I think, as follows. Marlowe, unlike some of his contemporaries, was not by nature a dramatist and his habit of mind was strongly subjective. It is therefore a reasonable inference to regard as matters of special concern to the writer those passages (mainly in *Tamburlaine*'s own speeches) which were expressed with the deepest intensity and in which verbal music and imagery simultaneously reach their greatest power. For it will generally be found in poetry that where the greatest artistic power is revealed there has been the most potent inspiration, the deepest sense of significance in the author's mind. (Space does not allow of the establishing here of this elementary aesthetic law: if *a posteriori* evidence is required, there are the comments in the journals, letters and critical works of many poets to testify that it is so.) Therefore it

is neither illogical nor evasive to see, in those speeches of Tamburlaine that stand out by reason of their passion and poetic power, matter that held peculiar significance for Marlowe, that was to that degree 'autobiographical'.

For some of us, a quarter of a century spent mainly in the study of dramatic aesthetics has served only to confirm deeply the conviction that Marlowe was one of those poets who, like Chapman (and, in lesser degree, Webster) among his own contemporaries, would probably have written little drama if certain other means of artistic expression had been equally within their reach. His initial concern was not primarily with the varieties and interrelation of character, but with essential passions, often with impassioned thought, and this, though it may, and indeed does, enter into drama, is not the basic dramatic process as we find it in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Plautus, the author of the Towneley comedies, Shakespeare, Middleton, Molière, Hebbel, Ibsen, Hauptmann, Tchekov and O'Neill. It is a matter of pretty general agreement among those who study Marlowe alongside his fellow-dramatists of all periods, and not merely alongside his fellow-Elizabethans, that he is distinguished, in that company, for the paradoxical union of dramatic concentration and immediacy with an essentially undramatic indifference to normal human experience, variations and relations; to that universal material of human character, in fact, which is the fundamental pre-occupation of the born dramatist. This conclusion may perhaps free us from the onus of failing to distinguish between drama and autobiography.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

LONDON

Shakespeare and other Masters. By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. ix+430 pp. 25s. 6d.

The subjects treated in this book are 'Dramatic Texture in Shakespeare', '"Reconciliation" in Tragedy', 'Shakespeare and Jonson', the characters of Hamlet, Othello, Oedipus and Iago, *The Tempest*, *Phèdre*, 'Tartuffe, Falstaff and the Optique du Théâtre', 'Art and artifice in the *Iliad*', and 'The Tragic Fallacy, so called'. The general line of argument follows that of the author's previous studies on kindred themes. The poetic dramatist is concerned primarily not with realism, ethic or psychology but with action and situation creating the maximum of emotional intensity; 'not primarily truth but emotional effect and, if need be, no more than a momentary or conditional acceptance'; 'not primarily to present character as its own destiny, but to arouse our sympathies to the uttermost' (pp. 160, 230). We turn to Sophocles and Shakespeare not chiefly for criticism of life, since 'poetry is not a gospel, tragedy not a play with a "message", no answer to the riddle of existence in either is ever satisfied' (pp. 81, 82); for reconciliation in tragedy is poetic rather than religious or ethical. The same applies to epic poetry as exemplified in Homer's characterization of Achilles, which has been generally misinterpreted by commentators from Horace downwards through ethical and humanitarian considerations. Shakespearean comedy likewise, while allowing greater freedom for analysis than tragedy or epic, is poetic and emotional rather than

realistic; and though in this respect Jonson and Molière are nearer the moderns than Shakespeare, they too look first for the creation of objective, dramatic effect, never pursuing the process of subjective analysis to the same lengths as Ibsen or his successors. If, then, criticism is to be regarded as 'primarily, if not ultimately interpretation', the critic of the older drama and epic should find little use for 'the vagaries of sentimentality and the irrelevance of psychology'.

Professor Stoll has long been recognized as one of the ablest Shakespearian critics of our time, and the present collection of essays matches its predecessors in abundance of sound scholarship, penetration and good sense. The basic principles voiced throughout his earlier Shakespearian studies are confirmed through application to a broader field of comparative criticism which includes, beside Shakespeare, Homer, Sophocles, Jonson, Racine and Molière. Of purely Shakespearian studies the most outstanding is that of Iago, a forceful and convincing interpretation of this 'devil in the flesh; a "condensation" of the Vice, the Senecan hero-villain, the *fallax servus* and the Machiavel'. The character of Hamlet is a subject already so overworked as to entail some recapitulation of familiar material which in places makes heavy reading. Professor Stoll's strong objections to the views of Professor Dover Wilson, already expressed in articles contributed to *Modern Philology* (August 1937, August 1939) and to the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* (1938) are reiterated throughout this essay and form the subject of a long appended note. His own interpretation of Hamlet as of a dramatic creation pure and simple designed to captivate the attention of an Elizabethan audience allows as little room for ingenious speculation on particular episodes, words or phrases as for exaggerated emphasis upon psychological motives or topical interests. For similar reasons he rejects any allegorical or autobiographical interpretation of *The Tempest* as inconsistent with Shakespeare's art.

This type of criticism is a welcome relief, providing a wholesome antidote to much waste material which has accrued to the study of earlier drama during the last two centuries. Prepared to join issue with scholars and commentators of the highest repute, Professor Stoll substantiates his case with such vigour and so sure a sense of values as broadly to carry conviction. But one cannot help feeling at times that his unqualified aversion from applying modern values, for instance in psychology, to earlier drama overreaches itself. His assertion that Shakespeare 'provided nothing that can be called a psychology' and 'dispensed with a psychology' is unacceptable if the term psychology is to bear any but the most specialized meaning. For every creator of character, in the very process of holding up the mirror to nature, provides a psychology conducive to that emotional intensity upon which Professor Stoll rightly insists. The nature and scope of psychological interest will vary as between different plays and different ages. It obviously contributes less to *Othello*, Shakespeare's masterpiece in pure 'theatre', than to *Hamlet* which, notwithstanding Professor Stoll's denial, must surely have been influenced by the widespread contemporary interest in analysis of humours. Moreover, the 'emotional intensity' of any drama, ancient or modern, emanates beyond its purely objective elements to the subjective reactions of the particular audience before whom it is presented. Thus, while the objective qualities of Sophocles

and Shakespeare are permanent and unchangeable, their significance to a modern audience differs in many respects from their original significance to their contemporaries. The fact that Shakespeare's psychology is 'diffused' rather than 'methodized' cannot prevent a modern audience from instinctively methodizing that psychology by modern tenets, and the same may be said of other modern inferences from earlier drama with respect to realism or ethic. Within reasonable limits such inferences follow of necessity from the work of a universal artist, 'not of an age, but for all time'.

The author's firm conviction and desire to strike home his message have occasioned a tendency towards repetition and prolixity which is enhanced by a regrettable habit of circumlocution exemplified in 'the Tiburtine', 'the Gallic', 'the Norman', 'the Norwegian', 'the Scottish Queen and the Venetian Ancient', 'every actor aspires to the Danish rôle', 'the two Germans ignore what the Stagirite says'. But these are minor blemishes in a work of outstanding scholarship, the reading of which will amply repay all who are prepared to chew and digest it.

B. E. C. DAVIS

LONDON

The Use of Rhyme in Shakespeare's Plays. By F. W. NESS. (*Yale Studies in English*, 95.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. 168 pp. 18s. 6d.

The main aims of this book are 'to present a recount of the couplets and other rhymes in Shakespeare's plays', and—the more general and speculative aim—to examine these rhymes 'with a view to tracing the development of Shakespeare the artist'—offering specially 'a more satisfactory explanation of Shakespeare's gradual abandonment of rhyme'.

In the first of these aims Mr Ness's work is very successful. He has taken trouble to consider what can and what cannot be counted as rhymes according to Elizabethan pronunciation. He has (unlike Heuser, whose *Der Coupletreim in Shakespeare's Dramen* is the only other specialist study of this subject) dealt with rhymes other than rhymed couplets. His listing, for the first time, what he calls the 'speech-pause' rhyme is plausible, and seems to me an additional reason for ceasing to speak of the exit and scene- or act-end rhymes as cues to actors or even as compensating for the probable lack of a curtain on the Elizabethan stage. The tables in his Appendix B are complete and informative.

The second aim of the book—though it gives an order to the whole which is not to be found in Heuser's work—seems to me less well fulfilled. Indeed, I cannot find that Mr Ness has drawn any general conclusions from his work other than the old conclusion that the changes in Shakespeare's use of rhyme and his gradual, though never total, abandonment of it, are part of the growth in freedom of his versification throughout. Perhaps no more than this was to be expected, for a study limited strictly to the rhymes themselves cannot bring us far; but even in his illustration of this theme Mr Ness's distinctions are often vague, and his interpretation not always reliable. The rhymes in *Richard II*, III, ii, 103–4 and in 2 *Henry IV*, IV, v, 219–20 are both called by Mr Ness 'cries' and 'emotional climaxes': the subtlety of mood expressed in

these passages, as their contexts show, cannot be so simply described; and when we come to seeing an affinity between them and rhymes of 'graceful welcome' such as Portia's in *Merchant of Venice*, III, i, 315-16, and an opposition of both to the 'sententious observation' or 'gnomic utterance', as in *Two Gentlemen*, v, iv, 108-9, we are in danger of losing our way. Mr Ness's book should, however, be useful to all those who are interested in Shakespeare's use of his medium or have their own speculations about the kind of stage-effects at which he was aiming.

J. W. R. PURSER

GLASGOW

Henry Lawes, Musician and Friend of Poets. By WILLA McCLUNG EVANS. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xvi+250 pp. 16s. 6d.

This book is a careful and fully documented biography, chiefly interesting for its account of the way of life of a musician at the court of Charles I and for its evidence of a growing admiration of foreign composers and foreign performers, which seems to have started in Henrietta Maria's circle and was to have such pernicious effects on English music in the latter part of the century.

But what most readers of this book will expect to find is, first, an account of the collaboration between Lawes and the distinguished poets whose lyrics he set to music, and secondly, some means of assessing Lawes's merits as a song writer. Their expectations will not be completely satisfied. Dr Evans discusses the part which Lawes played in the production of court masques, analyses several of Lawes's songs, quotes Lawes's account of his intentions in song writing, and provides a three-page summary of his methods. All this is well done, and so is the preparatory study of Lawes's musical education, which shows what Lawes learned from the Elizabethan and Jacobean masters. The comparison, too, between Lawes's and Monteverde's recitative is interesting. The use of the available material in fact leaves little room for criticism; it is Dr Evans's exposition which is disappointing. Just as quotation is essential in the study of a poet, so musical illustration is essential in the study of a composer, and the most thorough analysis will not fill the place of the printed stave. It is true that Dr Evans has reproduced in facsimile six passages from Lawes's autograph manuscripts and half a dozen other facsimiles of his work. But this is not all we require. A facsimile cannot easily be read. Lawes's hand retained several Secretary forms, not in themselves difficult to decipher, but sufficient to check the reader's career and distract his attention, which is already busy enough with a notation differing in one or two characteristics from the modern notation he is accustomed to. Only prolonged practice can give sufficient ease in reading to hear the music so presented. What was clearly needed was modern transcriptions in the text by way of illustration, such as Mr Kastendieck gave us in his study of Campion, and an appendix of at least a dozen modern transcriptions of Lawes's songs. With them we should have been better able to follow Dr Evans's examination of the spanning of 'Words with just note and accent' (even after reading this book, the reviewer is still inquiring why Milton thought that Lawes was the *first* who so taught our

English music): without these transcriptions we are no nearer to assessing Lawes's merits as a song writer. An opportunity has been lost.

JOHN BUTT

LONDON

The Rochester-Savile Letters, 1671-1680. Edited by JOHN HAROLD WILSON. Columbus: Ohio State University Press. 1941. ix+127 pp.

It was a happy idea to bring together into some sort of orderly correspondence the letters passing between Lord Rochester and Henry Savile in the second decade of the Restoration. The thirty-three letters to and fro, now jockeyed into at least conjectural sequence, had lain about in various printed collections, the nineteen from Rochester having indeed enjoyed a *succès de scandale* from their first publication as *Familiar Letters*, 1697. Savile's letters to Rochester, on the other hand, were not given to the public till the Historical Manuscripts Commission printed eleven of them in the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, 1907. The remaining three of the fourteen here given were printed by Johannes Prinz in his *John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*, 1927.

The present editor's task of fitting these letters into position and supplying the indispensable notes to them has been praiseworthy discharged, and the equally indispensable Introduction providing notes on the doings and whereabouts of the two correspondents during the decade completes our indebtedness for a singularly satisfying piece of research.

Probably the historian will welcome Mr Wilson's book rather more than the literary student. For although letters are glanced at in various passages of the correspondence, it is the more disreputable or modish sort of letters, dear to the 'mob of gentlemen who wrote with ease'. And, more insupportable, the young men affect a languorous insolence even when they refer to genuine poets. 'He is a rarity which I cannot but be fond of, as one would be of a Hog that could fiddle, or a singing owl' is one of Rochester's choice allusions to Dryden. Waller and Butler are neatly trussed up together by Savile: 'This is only to enclose these last workes of Mr Waller which I promised you in my last. Hee has found noe more applause then I doubt Mr Butler will from a third volume of *Hudibras* hee has newly put out....' An insolent squib, *Advice to Appollo*, 1678, which may have been by Buckingham, and is in effect a vulgar satire on Dryden, the Earl of Mulgrave, and others, makes them uncommonly merry. This irreverence to the contemporary muse was no doubt justified, but the tone is in keeping with the graceless attitude of the 'wits' to everything round them.

Mr Wilson is hopeful enough to find in this correspondence an answer to the 'perennial defamers of the Restoration rakes'. With all the will in the world I can only discover in it justification for the strictures of the puritans. One must look elsewhere for the evidence that Restoration society was by no means universally affected by the moral *malaise* reflected in these letters. That Court Society was so affected is amply borne out by Mr Wilson's excellent notes which leave one with the impression of a society wholly given over to libertinism.

Not that there is nothing to admire in the conduct of the wits as reflected in this correspondence. Savile, in particular, attracts by gleams of generosity. Here is a young rake who can unblushingly date a letter from 'Leather Lane in Hatton Garden' (a hospital for the prevailing disease), but who can also report that his 'health is drunke all over Scotland' on account of a vote thrown against 'that filthy dog Lauderdale' in the teeth of the Court. He paid for it by what, Mr Wilson assures us, is the only recorded instance of Charles II's unbridled wrath. Apart from that we must allow for the mask of banter habitually worn by courtier wits. They are malcontents in the Elizabethan sense. 'Few Men here dissemble their being rascals; and no Woman disowns being a Whore.'

I said that the historian would relish this correspondence more than the student of letters. Here is intimate gossip about the King's mistresses and how they were 'managed' by the politicians; here are familiar notes on the Popish Plot and the creatures who contrived it; here are sidelights on the business of foreign diplomacy and the reaction in the House of Commons to the proposals to increase the army in view of the situation abroad in 1678. Mostly hearsay, of course, but confidential hearsay from one who was so close to the King as Savile was is valuable.

But, I repeat, the value of Mr Wilson's work lies in reducing scattered letters into an orderly correspondence, providing it with pertinent notes, and relating the events in the lives of the correspondents which have a bearing on their letters.

G. KITCHIN

EDINBURGH

Horace Walpole's Correspondence with George Montagu. Edited by W. S. LEWIS and RALPH S. BROWN, JR. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. Vol. I, lvi+418 pp. Vol. II, vii+560 pp. £4. 14s. 6d.

These two volumes, preceded by the correspondence with William Cole and Madame du Deffand, constitute the ninth and tenth volumes of the magnificent Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's letters; and for most readers the letters to Montagu are, as Mr Lewis says, 'of more general interest than are those written to any other correspondent'. In part this is due to the subject-matter, their day-to-day reflexion, as in a mirror, of the English scene and people of quality during the middle of the eighteenth century. Further, the easy, witty, and familiar character of the letters, on both sides, makes for pleasant reading. Montagu, who idled and dozed agreeably through life, could write well himself, he was a good foil, and he summoned the best from Walpole. They belonged to the narrow circle of the aristocracy and landed squirearchy, who, living on broad acres, filled their houses with paintings ransacked from the continent of Europe, with portraits of long lines of ancestors, with massive furniture and objects of art. Many of these country seats were known to both friends. Walpole's happiest recreation was to visit these great houses, noting all that they contained, by preference when the owners were from home. Both correspondents, further, were Whigs, and members of the oligarchy, which, in the days of the Hanoverian dynasty, governed England. The table of Montagu's

family relationships, emblazoned with peerages, stood athwart the history of the country from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards. When his correspondence with Walpole came to an end there were still seventy or eighty years to run before the onset of the industrial revolution undermined the supports of the great Whig families.

In this setting Montagu and Walpole wrote to each other. For thirty years their letters depict the social and parliamentary scene, together with those who moved authoritatively or elegantly across the stage. They met at Eton, Montagu then a boy four years older than Walpole. They both went up to Cambridge, the one to Trinity, the other to King's College. Though not in company they both made the grand tour. Thereafter Montagu was content with his fireside, his claret, good feeding, and occasional visits to relatives. True he sat in two parliaments, and, in the course of a lazy life, accepted sinecure posts, but nothing, not even the immense family influence at his call, could rescue him from obscurity. His correspondence with Walpole alone retrieves him from almost complete oblivion. The *D.N.B.* knows nothing of him. But he had some parts. John Nichols, in his *Literary Anecdotes*, prints a letter from George Hardinge, who knew Montagu. Hardinge describes him as resembling Walpole in effeminacy of appearance and rivalling him in wit.

Montagu's contribution to these volumes is less than Walpole's. For twenty-three years, from 1736, the date of the first letter, to the end of 1758, we have only fourteen letters from Montagu against more than one hundred by Walpole. The real correspondence runs for little more than ten years. That a close friendship of nearly a lifetime, supported by sincere admiration on Montagu's part and genuine feeling on Walpole's, should have flickered out like a dying candle is difficult to understand, and we shall never know the whole story. According to Walpole his friend dropped him 'partly from politics and partly from caprice' after he had 'shed almost all his friends as well'. But there had always been the possibility of a break. Walpole's letters are often written in a scolding mood, partly in humour, though the sentences have a turned edge. Montagu lived another ten years; Walpole, who nursed his health, nearly thirty.

Almost all the original letters belonging to both sides of this correspondence have been, by good fortune, preserved together. After George Montagu's death, Frederick Montagu, his second cousin, sent Walpole's letters back to him. Walpole, after striking out some passages and making a few notes, returned them together with the letters he had received from Montagu. Frederick Montagu died in 1800, and, in course of time, the letters passed into the possession of the Dukes of Manchester (members of the Montagu family) at Kimbolton Castle. The text of the letters, normalized in conformity with the practice adopted for this edition, is printed from photostats of the originals.

Cunningham and Mrs Toynbee collated Walpole's original letters, the former, however, only after his earlier volumes were in print. The Yale editors correct misreadings and redate letters open to doubt and conjecture. Montagu often failed to give full or exact dates. Furthermore, headings are given for letters obviously missing. Passages which earlier editors shirked for their impropriety are printed in full. But these amount to little, and the reader tempted to look for them will waste his labour. A few further corrections appear. For example,

previous editors printed as two the letter Walpole began on 23 July 1763, and finished two days later.

The primary contribution of the Yale editors, apart from annotation, is the publication for the first time of Montagu's letters, 187 in number. It is true that Cunningham printed some fragments, more were published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and two letters appeared in the first supplement to Mrs Toynbee's edition of Walpole's letters, but the aggregate was a small part of the whole. Montagu can now be judged as a correspondent, we can better understand why Walpole wrote to him so well, and the character of their friendship takes on a new meaning.

The editors' task in providing a commentary which, without cumbrous expansion, leaves nothing unexplained for a ready understanding of the letters has not been easy. Many allusions are of a private or family character, meaningless to others though immediately intelligible to the correspondents and a narrow circle of acquaintance. In the end, however, little is left in doubt. The number of people to whom reference is made is, as would be expected, very large, and no less large the number of events, major or minor, described or glanced at in these pages. Skilful and industrious use has been made of contemporary newspapers and periodicals, of biographies and memoirs, in illustration of allusions in the text. All this has been extraordinarily well done; and, further, a great merit of the editors' annotation is its planned consistency. The exactness of the method enables them to combine compression with a detailed completeness. In addition, the compilers of the index, Dr Warren Hunting Smith and Mrs Richard G. Gettell, deserve a tribute for the analytical and reference value of their work.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

ASPENDEN, HERTFORDSHIRE

Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs Hester Lynch Thrale (later Mrs Piozzi), 1776-1809. Edited by KATHERINE C. BALDERSTON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1942. 2 vols. xxxii+1191 pp. 42s.

'It is many Years since Doctor Samuel Johnson advised me to get a little Book, and write in it all the little Anecdotes which might come to my Knowledge, all the Observations I might make or hear; all the Verses never likely to be published, and in fine ev'ry thing which struck me at the Time. Mr Thrale has now treated me with a Repository,—and provided it with the pompous Title of *Thraliana*; I must endeavour to fill it with Nonsense new and old. 15: September 1776.' This, reminding us as it does of Johnson's famous phrase in a letter written to Boswell eight months later ('I am engaged to write little Lives, and little Prefaces, to a little edition of the English Poets'), was the origin of the six fine quarto manuscript volumes now in the Huntington Library and here, with the Library's co-operation, edited in their entirety by Professor Balderston. That these would prove of great interest had been made clear by the excerpts (amounting to about one-fourteenth of the whole) printed by Hayward in 1861 and Hughes in 1913; that they were of considerable importance no one could doubt after the publication last year of Mr J. L. Clifford's biography of Mrs Thrale and the Oxford English Texts

edition of Johnson's poems by Professor D. Nichol Smith and Dr E. L. McAdam. Their appearance in print now allows us to assess that importance from three different standpoints.

The subject-matter of *Thraliana* falls under three convenient heads the *Ana* proper, information about Johnson and other literary figures, and autobiography. The first of these needs but a sentence or two: were the volumes all *Ana* they would be a typical rag-bag of notes hardly deserving the name of literature. Even the curious will wish to pick and choose among the hundreds of witticisms and near-witticisms, the odds and ends from her reading, the moral observations, the stories of fine men, women of fashion and remarkable children, the sometimes fantastic but oftener trite speculations with which she industriously, nay determinedly, overcame the challenge of blank paper. But the literary gossip and anecdotes are another matter. Johnson is the colossus who bestrides a hundred pages at a time, but Boswell, Burke and the Burneys, Garrick and Goldsmith, Mrs Montagu, Murphy and Mrs Siddons are never long forgotten. Mrs Thrale was an untiring collector of 'lions'; she took herself seriously as a hostess of the arts, so it is not surprising that she has much to tell of these and other poets, actors, painters and musicians. The interest here transcends that of mere anecdotage. There is the remarkable picture of Johnson, less worked-up than that in the *Anecdotes* of 1786, a work which Professor Balderston shows to be based almost entirely on *Thraliana*; there are sketches of other prominent contemporaries by, a woman whom even her detractors cannot convict of dullness, and acute judgments on their characters and productions alike. She has preserved too rather more than twenty of Johnson's poems, most of them trifles not intended for publication but copied out with his knowledge and approval, and since for most of these there is no Johnson manuscript *Thraliana* must be the ultimate authority for their text. Poems by feebler hands are scattered plentifully over her pages—Mr Woodman, Mr Mostyn, Mr Clarges and 'Mrs Siddons's Husband' are represented as well as the better-known Harriet Lee, William Hayley and Robert Merry, and the list might be much extended. Mrs Thrale's own effusions (at least several score in number) follow almost every fashion of the age and are therefore not without interest, though their poetic merit is slight.

There remains the autobiographical writing. In a sense, of course, the literary anecdotage is part of Mrs Thrale's autobiography, but for the moment I confine the term to Mrs Thrale's record of her own life. It may be said straightway that *Thraliana*, voluminous and revealing though it is, does not set its author among the best practitioners of this kind. It is confused and haphazard, the interruptions are innumerable and too often serve no useful purpose, it neither offers a careful selection nor tells all. Mrs Thrale had been writing busily for over a year and had filled 274 pages of the present edition before we meet the words: 'I will now in the Year 1778 write out a life of my self; at least a little Epitome of whence I came, who I am etc.' With this Epitome she concludes her second volume, but she has gone half-way through the third before the diary becomes more important than the *Ana*. There is disproportion too in the space and attention allowed to various decades. These faults (if we consider *Thraliana* as a work of art) cramp its merit, but it is only fair to add that we are really dealing with a commonplace book rather

than a deliberately designed autobiography. Even so, there is much that is completely successful, in particular her account of her love for and life with Piozzi, with its poignant last entry:

'30 March 1809. Every thing most dreaded *has* ensued,—all is over; & my second Husbands Death is the last Thing recorded in my first husband's Present! Cruel Death!'

She lived another twelve years, without her beloved Piozzi, and never lost the itch to write, but *Thraliana* is unrivalled in importance by any other of her works, published or unpublished. It is a new source-book for the literary gossip or historian, no student of society and manners will read it unrewarded, and if I say nothing here of the self-revealed character of this remarkable woman it is only from a desire not to repeat, in days of economy and shortage, what has already been said in this journal by way of review of Mr Clifford's judicious *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs Thrale)*.¹ The editing of this bulk of manuscript (it runs to not less than 400,000 words) is of the highest order. What Mrs Thrale wrote has been reproduced faithfully and completely, there is a wealth of first-rate annotation (much of it from unpublished sources), the 92-page Index serves the dual purpose of a textual index and a skeleton biographical dictionary, and a successful attempt has been made to preserve the individual flavour of the original manuscript by careful typographical arrangement. There is a brief and well-balanced Introduction, and in every way Professor Balderston's work demands the attention and deserves the gratitude of students of the eighteenth century.

GWYN JONES

ABERYSTWYTH ;

The English Notebooks. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. Edited by RANDALL STEWART. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xlv + 667 pp. 36s.

The complete collection of Hawthorne's journals, upon which Professor Stewart has been engaged, now awaits only *The Italian Notebooks* to be edited by Mr N. H. Pearson. *The English Notebooks* were well worth Professor Stewart's, and the reader's, attention. First, they have been available hitherto only in Mrs Hawthorne's bowdlerized version of 1868–71. The character and the extent of her revision are admirably and amusingly illustrated in the Introduction. The result is that Hawthorne appears as a much more robust and lively commentator than before in the faithful edition now given, and a portrait of the man emerges which makes his comment even more worth considering, and weighing. Secondly, the long history of the relations between English and American is a matter of no small importance. This book is a navigational document, even as are Dickens's *American Notes*, and both chart dangers, sunken rocks of the past with the foam of controversy still washing them, or reefs of unfamiliarities such as embarrass the American and disturb the Englishman in grain. The rhetoric of the Cockney Dickens parallels here

¹ *M.L.R.* xxxvi (1941), pp. 534–6.

the pungently critical observation of the Yankee Hawthorne, who was exclusive enough in his own way, e.g.

I do HATE a naturalized citizen: nobody has a right to our ideas, unless born to them (p. 96).

In the long run, it turns out to-day that as the two nations started out with the same foundations for their ideas, so after one and three-quarter centuries they appear to have arrived at the same conclusions in all matters of real importance to mankind. And there is an irresistible emergence of good-will in all honest consideration of these relations, which is present in Dickens as in Hawthorne. Dickens opens his *American Notes* with the words

In all the public establishments of America, the utmost courtesy prevails, and Hawthorne finds, after all, that

The English are a good and simple people, and take life in earnest, and ends his journal with these words:

I have now been so long in England that it seems a cold and shivery thing, to go anywhere else.

At the end of his life he was longing to return to England.

A visit to New England is necessary often to supply the grave twist of a humorous mouth below unwinking eyes, invisible on a printed page. But it would be idle to deny Hawthorne's determination to see no good in Englishmen in the abstract, and to assert the relative merits of things and people American, as it would be to fail to observe the frequent refutation of his views by his own experience, no less candidly set down. He sticks to his guns, despite his own fire. It was a question of loyalty. No wonder he liked Philip Richardson of Louisville, Kentucky, who had fought the English in 1812:

He is as dogmatic as possible, having formed his own opinions—often on very disputable grounds—and hardened in them... but with a keen strong sense at the bottom of his character. Only America could have produced such a man as this. (p. 439.)

It is obvious, finally, that these *Notebooks* are essential for the study of other works of Hawthorne, particularly *Our Old Home*, which draws heavily upon the *Notebooks*. Professor Stewart's Notes are helpful in this respect, as in others, and his Introduction is a very valuable comment upon the *Notebooks*, helping the reader to attain to balance and proportion. It is well to bear in mind the time-perspective which is so important in these matters, and to realize that when Hawthorne was thus setting down his notes upon England and the English his world was a little nearer to the events of the American War of Independence than to those of the present war in which his country and ours are comrades in arms for the second time in a generation. And there was much throwing about of brains and words in England upon slavery when Hawthorne was writing.

It seems odd that Hawthorne, who 'did' Oxford pretty thoroughly, never paid a visit of natural piety to Cambridge and to Emmanuel the mother-college of Harvard. He was, it is true, a Bowdoin man. There should have been a note upon the reference (p. 395) to 'Henry atte Hawthorne' of 'Aldremeston', in the hundred of 'Blakenhurste', Worcestershire. The reference is,

of course, to Alderminster, which is actually in the hundred of Pershore (not of Blackenhurst) in a detached island of the hundred, near Stratford. 'Aldremeston' is a fourteenth-century form of the name. Is it really possible, as would appear on p. 545, that Hawthorne could not distinguish between the Lancashire dialect of Southport and 'Scotch speech'? Southport could hardly be mainly populated by Northern Irish immigrants. Its visitors, he said, were mainly from Liverpool and Manchester. And elsewhere he refers to 'broad Lancashire dialect' at Ormskirk (p. 430). Possibly the comment on 'Scotch speech' should be referred to his visit to Durham and Yorkshire, and is uncritical enough in that connexion too. He is, indeed, oddly incurious about dialect, except such a striking phenomenon as spoken Welsh. 'Ben Crook' (p. 520) is surely Ben Cruachan. One would have been glad of a somewhat fuller index, and of a reproduction of a typical page or two of Hawthorne's manuscript, to complete the equipment of this handsome volume.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods. By NORMAN FOERSTER, JOHN MCGALLIARD, RENÉ WELLEK, AUSTIN WARREN, WILBUR L. SCHRAMM. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1941. viii+269 pp. \$3.00.

This collection is the result of the authors' dissatisfaction with the present state of literary scholarship in America and their conviction that 'considerable changes will have to be made in the training of the scholars of the future'. They attribute this enervation of American scholarship to an injudicious and excessive application of the spirit and method of science to literature, the piling up of the apparatus of philosophy, psychology and sociology until the ancillary material assumes greater importance than the original. Mr Foerster speaks for all the contributors when he acknowledges in the introductory essay the value of scientific discipline in literary study, but points out at the same time that the new need to be filled is for a scholarship more humane in spirit, affiliated with the creative and critical interests of literature itself rather than with related studies which pass the bounds of their usefulness.

When Mr Foerster has formulated the general position, his collaborators speak for the four 'disciplines' of literary study, linguistics, literary history, literary criticism, and imaginative writing. Their object is twofold: first, to define the services which literary scholarship can offer to society; secondly, to consider a plan for making the higher study of letters more living and creative. The value of the work of all five lies in their clear recognition of present discontents and of the responsibility towards those who must be well trained in the universities 'if the place of the humanities in education and life is to be effectively asserted'. They all write with enthusiasm and conviction, but they do not elaborate the hint in the preface that experiments towards new types of training have already been undertaken. Detailed explanation of these plans, involving data and statistics, is obviously a separate study, but a little more explanation would have enhanced the interest of the theories put forward here.

Mr McGalliard, who deals with the study of language, is keenly aware of the influence of the spoken and written word to-day, which is greater than ever before. It is clear from many scholarly editions which have recently appeared both in America and in England that the importance of studying the living language of the past is being increasingly recognized. There can be only imperfect communication with and understanding of literature if the study of language is not made a branch of humane studies. Mr McGalliard concludes his essay with a rapid survey of the latest developments of linguistic science, including the work of Professor Bridgman, Ogden, Richards, Korzybski and Vossler. Mr Wellek pleads for the study of literary history to be freed from the bias of philosophy, sociology and psychology, which foster the desire to find out more about the circumstances in which literature is conceived than about the quality of the work itself. He concurs with Mr Warren, who writes on literary criticism, in asking for a system of literary judgement which would concentrate on literature as an art, with its own principles and terminology, not those adapted from related sciences. In the present intellectual climate, Mr Wellek and Mr Warren, whose interests are really identical because of the impossibility of dividing literary history and criticism, feel that we study too much the 'background' and 'influences'. Mr Schramm has a difficult task in dealing with the writing of imaginative literature, which cannot easily be given a programme. He stresses the humanist view, the necessity of a stimulating relationship between the master and the 'apprentice writer' in the setting of the intellectual wealth of a university.

The spirit of the whole book augurs well for the future of American scholarship and for the training of the students for whom the new ideals are being built up. It is especially encouraging at this time, when the need for preserving the dignity of the individual mind seems to be, as the authors remark in the preface, more and more the responsibility of England and America.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

La Chanson de Roland. Edited by F. WHITEHEAD. (Blackwell's French Texts.) Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. xx+171 pp. 7s. 6d.

This edition offers an excellent text of the *Chanson de Roland*, and should be extremely useful both in university classrooms and elsewhere. Dr Whitehead adopts the principle followed by Bédier in 1922 (but not accepted by some later editors) that the readings of the Oxford MS. should be printed as they stand 'unless these readings are clearly the result of scribal error'; but the new text is far from being a slavish copy of Bédier's, and it is clear that all the difficult lines have been freshly considered, often with happy results. Dr Whitehead makes full use of the researches carried out by Waters and Samaran with the help of ultra-violet rays, as well as of recent work done by other scholars, and the result seems to be the nearest approximation we have yet had to the lost original of which the Oxford MS. is a copy.

Of course, no two people would agree on which readings are 'clearly the result of scribal error', and in a number of cases Bédier accepted unusual forms which the new editor rejects: *des* for *dis* ('ten', l. 3269), *graigne* for

graignur (l. 1088). Dr Whitehead is inclined to accept Samaran's dating of the MS. in the second quarter of the twelfth century, instead of Bédier's 'vers l'an 1170'; this makes it less probable that spellings such as *guer* for *guerre*, *trechant* for *trenchant*, *tro* for *trop*, and so on, represent the scribe's pronunciation, and such forms have been corrected. On the other hand, Dr Whitehead has found it possible to leave unaltered quite a number of MS. readings which Bédier had rejected. Thus in l. 147, the MS. has 'Voelt par hostages'; Dr Whitehead prints this, and translates 'he wishes it to be done by an exchange of hostages'; Bédier, like most other editors, emends here, but one may agree with the latest editor that the MS. reading is 'far from impossible', though it involves a violent ellipsis. Again, in ll. 3125-6, the MS. reads:

Passent cez puis e cez roches plus haltes
E cez parfunz cez destreiz anguisables.

Most editors, including Bédier, emend the second line to something like 'Cez vals parfunz etc.'; Dr Whitehead avoids the emendation by taking *parfunz* as a noun, 'depths, chasms'. This seems acceptable, in spite of the fact that Godefroy has no other example of this shade of meaning for the noun *parfont*. One more example will show how reluctant Dr Whitehead is to change the text of his MS.: l. 3936, describing the arrival of Charlemagne, says:

Ensembl'od lui de ses baruns quarante.

The word *quarante* is suspect both because it gives an impure assonance and because the poet immediately names *four* of Charlemagne's barons. *Quatre* would give an exact assonance, and so even Bédier emends the line and gives us

Ensembl'od lui de ses baruns ad quatre.

In the new edition the MS. reading is left unaltered.

In another group of passages, however, Dr Whitehead is less conservative than Bédier: this is where the Oxford MS. has a word or a half-line missing, or contains a phrase that obviously does not make sense. Bédier's practice in such cases was generally to leave a blank, or even to print something meaningless. This was understandable in 1922, when he wished to gain acceptance for his doctrine of the sacredness of the MS. text, but to-day this doctrine has been so widely accepted that editors can afford to be a little less uncompromising, and Dr Whitehead's method in these cases is to try to reconstruct the damaged text. This can sometimes be done with tolerable certainty, as in l. 2052, where there is help from a half-erased letter in the MS. as well as from other versions of the poem, but in l. 2815 a gap in the MS. is filled conjecturally with the word *ain*; this is more risky, as no such word has been so far recorded. On the whole though, it must be said that the emendations show admirable caution and restraint.

The edition contains a large number of lines that do not fit into the conventional ten-syllable pattern, since there is very strong evidence to show that this variety was the work of the poet. This principle (the only sound one) is pushed so far that even when a line has to be emended the editor does not mind leaving it a syllable short, if this enables him to keep nearer to the text of the MS. Thus we have in l. 3555

Païen d'Arabe s'en tienent plus quei,

where most editors print *cuntenent*. Dr Whitehead does, however, risk lopping three syllables off l. 2075, which has fifteen syllables instead of the usual ten.

The Notes and Variants give a very detailed account of the MS., with all its erasures and corrections, and the glossary seems to contain all the words that might trouble a beginner. It seems a pity, however, that for the more obscure words references are not given to the invaluable glossary published in Bédier's volume of commentaries; this would have put the student in touch with the discussions aroused by such words as *cuntenance* (*en faire la c.*), *decliner*, *esterminals*.

The introduction contains nothing on the literary value of the poem, nor indeed on any of the literary and historical problems that it raises, apart from the bibliographical note on p. xix. It is obvious that questions of paper and of price do not allow a long discussion of these questions, but it seems a pity that this edition should seem to lend support to the regrettable tendency of some scholars to treat Old French literature from the purely philological angle. These criticisms are however of little importance; the edition is an excellent piece of work and augurs well for the value of the medieval texts that are to be included in Blackwell's French Texts.¹

B. WOLEDGE

LONDON

La Grant Ystoire de Monsignor Tristan 'Li Bret'. Edited by F. C. JOHNSON.

Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd. 1942. xxii+166 pp. 15s.

This edition of 'the first part of the Prose Romance of Tristan from the Adv. MS. 19.1 3 in the National Library of Scotland' by Miss F. C. Johnson is the first reprinting of any text of the Prose Tristan since 1586. In the classical phrase, it is an edition which has been long overdue. For Miss Johnson, it marks the completion of a piece of work undertaken many years ago at the suggestion of Paul Meyer. Hitherto, all those who wished to study the Prose Romance of Tristan were compelled to have recourse either to one of the forty-eight manuscripts distributed throughout Europe, or to the early printed editions which are equally rare, or to the summary of the story written by Löseth in 1891. The importance of this edition therefore in making accessible part of one manuscript cannot be overrated.

Miss Johnson does not attempt in her Introduction to do more than give a brief survey of the theories already advanced concerning the origins of the Prose Tristan. One could, perhaps, wish that she had quoted more fully the 'later criticism' which holds that this work is not an independent derivative of the *Estoire*. In her palæographical description of the Edinburgh MS., she does not give quite enough details. One would like to know, for instance, the difference between an ordinary folio of text written in triple columns of 60 lines, and the folios on which the *lais* are written; the date of the writing of the title inserted 'later' on the first folio; and the reasons for her conclusion (p. xxii) that this manuscript was written from dictation.

¹ There are one or two misprints: p. xi, n. 1, 'l. 2974' should be 'l. 2874'; p. 121, '1211' should be '1210'; p. 130 (acuminjer), '3680' should be '3860'. In the Notes and Variants there should be a reference to the MS. reading *venir* in l. 602. On p. xiii the 'traditional' system of numbering the lines is used; this means that the line referred to as 299 is numbered, in the text, 317. If this clumsy method is adhered to, the student should at least be warned.

The comparison which Miss Johnson makes between the Edinburgh MS. and Loseth's analysis is most valuable. It is a pity that the manuscript stops before the crucial point which would have enabled her to place it without hesitation in Professor Vinaver's manuscript table, but her conjecture seems most probable.

The text of the manuscript itself is set out in a very readable form, and the references to Loseth make it easy to use for all purposes. The few notes deal chiefly with manuscript readings, and the book ends with a list of proper names. It is a pity that limitation of space has not allowed Miss Johnson to give a glossary, for the dialectal forms of many of the words make the text sometimes difficult to understand at first reading. However, the book as it stands is a valuable contribution to Tristan studies; no longer is this important medieval text 'enseveli dans de vieux parchemins et des imprimés fort rares'.

GWENETH HUTCHINGS

OXFORD

L'Influence des Littératures antiques sur la Littérature française moderne: État des travaux. By HENRI PEYRE. (*Yale Romanic Studies*, xix.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. 108 pp. 12s.

Professor Peyre, to whom we owe fine studies of nineteenth-century Hellenism, has now mapped out a considerably larger country, summarizing what has been discovered and indicating general problems and particular fields for exploration; for, as he shows, the difficulty facing the director of research is not to find subjects for his pupils, but rather the contrary. He points out how much our knowledge of the present domain will be enriched when we know more of the history of teaching in France, of the grammars, manuals, 'morceaux choisis', etc., which students read, of the translations of the Classics which were available, and can thus recapture something of the vision of the ancient world which came to successive generations. Not that, in his view, the true spiritual heirs of ancient Rome and Greece have been, in general, the 'good pupils'; the action of the ancient literatures has not promoted moderation or a conventional love of the past; and with certain exceptions, 'the worshippers of antiquity are enthusiasts, rebels and often sick men'.

No part of this book is more valuable than the pages devoted to contemporary literature. Through the successive revolutions effected by Symbolism, Neo-Classicism and Surrealism, the gods and the myths have survived; even the rebels cannot forget the ideal figures of Greek legend. One might add that in the unbalanced and anarchical world of to-day the nostalgia for those happy ages when, as M. Peyre says, 'literary creation was almost a collective work', is deeper and more desperate than ever it was in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries. Whether education can integrate the spirit of antiquity into a homogeneous modern civilization may appear doubtful; but M. Peyre is right in outlining the means by which he considers this may be effected. To the average student, he thinks, the heritage of the ancient world is best transmitted indirectly, through translations and through those masterpieces of the moderns who have themselves been steeped in antiquity. And in holding that, on the

contrary, a knowledge of the ancient languages should be part of the teacher's equipment, he does well to recommend a policy opposed to that habit of intense specialization in limited fields which is a marked weakness of our time.

It would be unfair as well as ungracious to suggest that there are lacunae in a work which cannot, and does not pretend to be, more than an outline. The significance of Alfred Jarry (who possessed an extraordinary knowledge of Greek) is, in part, that he illustrates one of M. Peyre's most brilliant generalizations. A little more space might perhaps have been devoted to the influence of the ancient philosophies on artistic literature; one is thinking, for example, of the action of Neo-Stoicism, through G. du Vair, on the age of Henri IV and Louis XIII; and of the curious fusion of Stoicism and Epicureanism in so distinctively modern a personality as S  nancour's. But a monograph of ninety-eight pages of text, being the first work of its kind devoted to a theme so vast, obviously cannot point to everything.

This is, from every point of view, an admirable book: concise, full of information, abounding in shrewd judgements, stimulating. A reviewer can do little more than describe it, and express a gratitude which he believes will be that of all scholars.

A. LYTTON SELLS

DURHAM

From Cubism to Surrealism in French Literature. By GEORGES LEMAITRE.
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1941.
247 pp. 16s. 6d.

This book presents a complete panorama of 'modernistic' literature in France, studied in connexion with painting. The majority of the writers and artists in question appear as young men passionately, and often pathologically, sensitive to the discordancies of the age in which we live. They have been tempted either to revolt hysterically against all surviving conventions, intellectual and moral, or to look for a complete disintegration of modern society, or to seek access to an 'other' world; a 'higher reality', by means of intuition, automatic writing, the artificial adoption of abnormal mental states, etc.; and they have tended to regard the work of art as entirely independent of all that can be grasped by the senses or by discursive reasoning. After tracing the origins of this characteristic modern movement, more particularly in Impressionism and Symbolism, Mr Lemaître shows how the breakdown of the old aesthetic was powerfully assisted by the scientific discoveries and philosophical doctrines of the nineteenth century at its close: it corresponds, as he says, to the 'breakdown in the old conception of reality'. And in describing the successive phases of vanguard art in France, from Jarry through Cubism, Futurism and Dada to the Surrealism which, revived after 1936, at present holds the field in this domain, he shows what proportion of the directive impulse has come at different times from Spanish, Italian and Jewish elements, from the impact on the younger generation of the first World War, from the physics of Einstein and the psychology of Freud. Only perhaps the Futurism of Gino Severini and his friends exhibits a definitely constructive power in its attempt to systematize, for art as well as for society, the growing mechanization of life

and assure the universal triumph of the artificial. But this comprehensible, if appalling, programme seems to have been too much at odds with the general nihilism of the vanguard poets and painters to enjoy more than a short-lived success.

Literature rather than painting has been chosen as 'the centre of perspective' because, in the author's words, the ideas even behind the paintings have been generally 'elaborated by writers'. This is true, for example, of Surrealism. Since the first World War the Surrealists have more or less propounded an ideal—based on a study of the child-mind and of all that we lose in growing up—which is to recover the power of ecstasy and exaltation of which we were capable as small children, to heighten it by means of our increased mental strength, and thus to achieve 'an intense and intimate communion between the human personality and the essence of the universe', by which our life 'will acquire its true . . . signification upon a higher . . . plane', and 'new creative energies will be released' (p. 196). This sounds promising, but it has not led to any outstanding achievements. Granting that Surrealism has found its 'most adequate mode of expression in the domain of plastic art', such specimens of symbolic (?) mystification, humorous though they may be, as Yves Tanguy's *Extinction des lumières inutiles*, such 'paranoiac dreams' as Salvador Dali's *Endless Enigma*, strike the observer as experiments leading to nothing.

Has the motive force underlying modernistic art been as unreasonable as its methods and manifestations have been grotesque? On the contrary, to Mr Lemaitre the faults of its productions appear as 'grave and disturbing symptoms of the moral confusion prevailing in our unbalanced epoch'. These vanguard writers have found in him a sympathetic and not, on the whole, over-complacent interpreter. He narrates the lives of their leaders, he records their successive campaigns with a clearness and sense of proportion that contrast humorously with the incoherence they themselves display. He writes with a sense of the delicacies as well as the resources of our language. The value of his book seems to the reviewer to transcend that of the writers it presents. There are ten full-page illustrations, significant and symptomatic *à souhait*; very full bibliographies, and an index.

A. LYTTON SELLS

DURHAM

Meier Helmbrecht, a poem by Werner der Gartenære. Edited by CHARLES E. GOUGH. (*German Mediæval Series*, Section A, Vol. II.) Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. xxxv+117 pp. 6s.

As is well known to anyone familiar with German studies in this country, *Meier Helmbrecht*—the most interesting of the shorter Middle High German poems—was fully appreciated only in the circle of Professor Gough, his pupils and his colleagues. Others may have approached the poem with the help of such commentaries as were elsewhere available, but they did so with the uneasy conscience of amateur poachers. The true *Helmbrecht* did not suffer in being, for many years, thus screened from less discerning eyes. When Professor Gough announced that he would retire to Exeter (a very energetic retirement,

one hears), it was obvious that the Leeds *Helmbrecht* circle, already somewhat unwieldy, would have to dissolve. There seemed to be no good reason for withholding the Gough *Helmbrecht*; it is now available to all.

Professor Gough's studies take the Ambras and Berlin MSS. as their starting-point. He has carefully reconsidered every variant and arrived at his critical text. The identity of the author and the location of the story are fully discussed; Professor Gough sees no reason to revise his view that the author was a Franciscan.

The introduction, notes and glossary of this edition, like Professor Gough's own teaching, have in mind students learning Middle High German, and, more particularly, the average student who needs a good deal of help. Whilst the editor revels in the good yarn his author has to tell, he insists on thorough interpretation; the careful study of this edition will be a sound introduction to Middle High German grammar.

To points of detail, there are a few misprints in the text: l. 601, read *heil*; ll. 765-6, read *wîf/lîf*; l. 1572, read *frœliche*; l. 1659, read *êre*. The cross-reference in note to l. 247 (*menen*) should be to l. 307 or l. 825, not to l. 792. The notes are, in the main, adequate. Perhaps a reference to traditional platitudes in the literature of the post-chivalrous period would help students over ll. 175-6, and 491 sqq. I still have difficulty with the logic of 576 sqq. (the Meier's first dream) and with ll. 1671-76. Perhaps Professor Gough missed an opening in discussing ll. 445 sqq.: *datz Ôsterriche clamurre*. The Meier's exhortation of his son rather to eat the Austrian 'delicacy' and stay honest is equivalent to a Yorkshireman endeavouring to persuade a wayward son to save his soul even if this means eating Lancashire hot-pot to the end of his days.

F. P. PICKERING

MANCHESTER

Christian Heinrich Schmid and his Translations of English Dramas. By L. M. PRICE. (*University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, vol. 26, No. 1.) Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1942. ix+122 pp. 7s. 6d.

The study of English influence on German writers has always been a productive approach to German literature and culture in the eighteenth century, and Professor Price has made it his particular task, in his earlier books, to show what English works, in what sort of translation and adaptation, were known in Germany in this period. The present study is an outcrop of his main work. The name of Christian Heinrich Schmid occurs repeatedly in the periodicals of the last third of the eighteenth century. Goethe (in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* as well as in *Das Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilen*) and Lenz (in *Pandämonium Germanicum*) poke fun at him; and historians of the theatre have gratefully used Schmid's *Chronologie des deutschen Theaters* of 1775, for which Schmid drew on the experience of living actors. It is only now, however, that we can get an idea of Schmid's importance in the literary development of those days; and though Professor Price does not allow himself to go much beyond the theme defined in his title, we also get an idea of Schmid's dependent, dull, but industrious personality.

Born in 1746 Schmid entered the literary arena rather rashly and became notorious for his indiscriminating taste—Herder called him a ‘Schmierer und Zusammenstopfer’. From the beginning he devoted himself to the task of improving the acquaintance of Germans with English literature, translating English belles lettres, and, above all, plays. Unfortunately his English was very poor and his pages are fuller of howlers than Wieland’s. His critical standards in his mature years were based on those of Lessing in the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, and he sought to clarify and simplify his originals. An enemy of bombast, he could find only one play of Shakespeare’s which pruning might make fit for production, *Othello*, and this play he changes so much that even Moses Mendelssohn was moved to sharp protest.

Between 1767 and 1789 Schmid published translations of 29 English plays, 21 of them in the series *Englisches Theater 1769–1777*. Professor Price has gone to great pains to investigate not only the merit of the translations but also their fortunes on the stage—only one, an adaptation and translation of Banks’s *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex*, was successful and, in a version of Laube’s, remained on the repertory of the Burgtheater till 1907. It was this play, too, which convinced Schröder in 1773 of the superiority of prose drama over poetical.

Professor Price’s study leads us with great learning into the paths of the average literary criticism and taste in the later part of the eighteenth century. Here and there we touch, with Schmid, the main stream of German literature. There remains the great problem: what has all this concern of Schmid’s with English (and French) writers contributed to German culture? of what value were his translations of Steele, Vanbrugh, Dryden, Cibber, of Prior, Akenside, etc., etc.? It is clear that they were of importance in building up a common stock of European culture and opinions; and yet the greater German writers had to tear themselves out of this morass of accepted values and notions.

R. PASCAL

BIRMINGHAM

Goethe and the Greeks. By HUMPHREY TREVELYAN. Cambridge: University Press. 1941. xv+321 pp. 18s.

In the seven years that have elapsed since he published *The Popular Background to Goethe’s Hellenism* (reviewed by the present writer in vol. xxx of this Journal) Mr Trevelyan has matured very notably in outlook and judgement. Gone is that note of polite condescension with which the *Alphilothee* is apt to look down on his modern counterpart, gone the sweeping statement of his former conclusion that ‘Goethe’s knowledge of the Greeks was confined to a few subjects and even in these was never profound’. Instead we are now assured that Goethe possessed an understanding of Greek art ‘as profound as it was original’, that ‘he knew Homer in his own way as thoroughly and understood him as deeply as any scholar could do’ (and this before 1775!), and that in *Iphigenie* he had effected a harmonious combination of the fundamental Trinity, Goodness, Truth and Beauty, such as the Greeks themselves never could have achieved! Another comparison, ‘odious’ though it may be, forces itself upon the reader: though Mr Trevelyan makes no profession of

this intention, his book is obviously an answer, and a very cogent and convincing answer, to Professor Butler's assertion of the tyranny of Greece over Germany. Mr Trevelyan shows very conclusively that this supposed tyranny was rather a beneficial tutelage without which Goethe himself, and we his followers in the modern world, would have been immeasurably the poorer.

The book is a very skilfully conducted voyage of discovery to the physical, moral and spiritual world of Goethe's Greece. We are shown his exciting discovery of the Greek myths as symbols of eternal truths, his vision of Greek sculpture as the highest moral and aesthetic ideal, his brave attempt to find Homer's Greece amongst the *Urlandschaft* and *Urmenschen* of Sicily, and the fundamental belief that in the human form was expressed the supreme synthesis of the physical and spiritual, the highest and noblest work of nature, the very microcosm of the universe as a whole. By sinking his individuality in the object, Goethe hoped to recapture that naive mood which is characterized by the absence of all personal relationship to the object. As Schiller knew so well, this mood of complete objectivity had always baffled the moderns and was eventually to baffle Goethe, though in the *Helena* of 1800 he came within an ace of success. Reluctantly Goethe was forced to recognize that he could not deny his northern, sentimental nature and *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert* (1805) is both his final confession of faith in the perfection of balanced humanity that he had sublimated from Greek art and literature, and his resignation to the knowledge that it could never be realized in the modern world. Instead he now looked for truth and beauty wherever they were to be found and freed himself from the tyranny of an absolute standard, though never disputing the vital importance of Greek culture for European man:

Wir sind vielleicht zu antik gewesen;
Nun wollen wir es moderner lesen.

Faust, the northern modern, was now as valuable a creature of God as Helen, and Greece was not the end, but only a stage on the road. In the *Wanderjahre* Goethe even went to the length of recommending a course in horse-breaking and modern languages (preferably Italian) as a training in that ideal harmony of hand and head which for him was education!

During the whole of his long life Goethe's occupation with Greece was constant and intense, and he was always revising and improving his knowledge. He soon realized that the Elgin marbles were worth all the statues in the Vatican put together, and his insight into the Dionysiac side of Greek civilization was more profound than Nietzsche would admit. He was particularly well versed in the byways of Greek literature, and in Plotinus he discovered a mind very congenial to his own. There are few utterances which we associate with the wisdom of the Sage of Weimar which cannot be paralleled from the *Enneads*. Goethe was as familiar with the ecstatic vision whether induced by art, love or death, as was the Greek mystic, and perhaps even more conscious of the essential unity of all ecstatic experience. Mr Trevelyan gives several interesting examples of this: of his being lost in contemplation of a bust of the Niobids, a state which Wieland likened to a visionary trance (p. 90); of the direct union with the World-Soul as expressed in his *Ganymed* (p. 75); of the 'hohe Verzückung' into which he often fell as he read Homer or Ossian,

so that his friends feared for his reason (p. 52); of the mystical foretaste of death experienced by Pandora in *Prometheus* (p. 75). Mr Trevelyan might have added that his love for Frau von Stein induced the same ecstasy ('Lösest endlich auch einmal Meine Seele ganz'), the same feeling of losing the individual self in the object of contemplation and so becoming one with the divine essence of which it is created. It is that union of the soul with God, says Plotinus, 'of which the union of earthly lovers, who wish to blend their being with each other, is a copy'. Only by thus dying unto himself (in God, in the loved one, in a work of art, for ultimately they are one and the same) could a man be reborn and return refreshed from his brief contact with reality. It was surely of these brief contacts with reality that Goethe was thinking when he spoke of 'Stirb und werde!' and not of the final and permanent contact which comes with dissolution of the body.

The field of Greek studies, comprising as it does the whole of man, is so vast that there must inevitably be gaps in Mr Trevelyan's survey. Goethe was, of course, a Platonist rather than an Aristotelean, but that does not excuse the one niggardly paragraph on Aristotle! For on the problem of catharsis Goethe pondered for a lifetime and offered an aesthetic solution which is in keeping with his belief in the re-creating effect of all art. And how fascinating to trace the figure of the tragic hero in so unlikely a quarter as *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*! Yet Goethe did tell Zelter that this work represented 'die innige wahre Katharsis' in all its purity and perfection. Like any Greek heroine Ottilie feels she is 'eine geweihte Person' and is painfully conscious of the tragic fate from which there is no escape:

Ich bin aus meiner Bahn geschritten und ich soll nicht wieder hinein. Ein feindseliger Damon, der Macht über mich gewonnen, scheint mich von außen zu hindern.

Goethe was haunted all his life by the gods and heroes of Greece: the Belvedere Apollo was not only 'the most inspired work of art in the world', it was also 'the best example of perfect humanity'; Helen was the symbol of all that the ancient world held of perfect grace and form; Odysseus was the eternal wanderer from hearth and home which Goethe so often felt himself to be; Prometheus was the incarnation on earth of the creative process of the universe, the surrogate of Jove himself. But the supreme poetic manifestation of Goethe's vision of ancient Greece is to be found, paradoxically enough, neither in the *Achilleis* nor even in *Iphigenie*, but in *Hermann und Dorothea*, which it is good to find Mr Trevelyan defending as 'the crown and the justification of Goethe's Hellenism'. Here, says Mr Trevelyan, was the re-creation of epic poetry, here were the *Urlandschaft* and the *Urmenschen* derived from the study of Homer. 'Their existence is still inextricably bound to that of inconscient Nature; and this closeness to Nature develops in them a natural fineness of feeling, an instinctive goodness that holds them nearer to God.'

Mr Trevelyan writes with imagination as well as learning, and there are many refreshing judgements in this book. It is informed by openness of mind and sympathetic appreciation which have caught something of Goethe's own large-hearted tolerance for the 'genuine merits of other forms of life'. But that the Greek ideal, impossible though it was of realization in the modern world, was the highest ever attained by man, of that neither Goethe, nor

Mr Trevelyan, has the slightest doubt. And it is, as he says, in the re-statement of this ideal through the medium of the greatest personality of the modern world that the significance and value of Goethe's Hellenism lie.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY

LONDON

The Writings of Jakob Wassermann. By JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House. 1942. 410 pp. \$3.75.

As the title indicates, this substantial volume provides a study of the writings of Jakob Wassermann, rather than any exhaustive account of his life or analysis of his personality. The works are numerous, for Wassermann, with his inordinate 'Lust zu fabulieren', was a prolific writer. After a very short Biographical and Introductory Sketch (some eleven pages), in which the main facts are set forth rapidly and lucidly, as found in Wassermann's *Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude* or reflected in the autobiographical content of the various novels, the author proceeds to deal with the writings in careful chronological order within the following classifications: Novels and Novellen, Biographical Writings, Autobiographical Writings, Plays. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that this arrangement presents the main dishes first, following them up with the variously flavoured hors-d'œuvre of autobiographical detail and ending with the very thin fare of Wassermann's few dramas of intrigue which are generally recognized, as they were acknowledged by the author himself, to be his weakest writings. Full references for quotations are given in some two and a half pages of notes, followed by a very useful bibliography of the author's publications in the original, and a list of English and American translations. A brief bibliography of books and articles about Wassermann mentions the most useful reference-material concerning an author about whom comparatively little has been written.

The present volume is, indeed, the first full-length account of Wassermann's work to appear in any language. It should serve as a reliable guide to those who wish to secure a clear view of that writer's output and its content. Professor Blankenagel's method is to focus attention on each work in succession, to analyse its content and to enumerate the chief features of its style. At the same time he is careful to show the common ground which exists between the various works as regards favourite themes, underlying motifs (e.g. *Trägheit des Herzens*), or the overlapping of typical characters (such as Agathon, Etzel or the *Stiefmuttertyp*). His method may, perhaps, be described as a kind of 'spotlight' technique by which each work is made to stand out with its main features sharply out-lined, contemporary literature being in the meantime 'blocked out'. It has the disadvantage of giving us little or no sense of the relationship between the work thus treated and the tendencies, writings or conditions of the age in which it appeared—with the exception of the reference to Russian literature, emphasized by Wassermann himself and since dealt with by other writers. This is a pity, since Wassermann's writings may legitimately be considered to have less permanent value as literature than as evidence of the life and outlook of a considerable section of society in his time and country.

During his lifetime, covering the important years 1873-1934, many interesting literary movements were afoot in Germany.

Professor Blankenagel does not hesitate to compare some of his author's peculiarities of style with those of the 'dime-novel', nor does he fail to point out melodramatic qualities of plot which put so great 'a tax on the credulity of his readers'. But we think he might have gone further than he does. Like certain German critics, he seems to be unduly influenced by Wassermann's own view of his purpose and his achievement as, for example, when, in dealing with *Caspar Hauser*, he tells us without further comment that 'Wassermann asserts that he strove to recreate all the personages around Caspar Hauser, his world, time, destiny, inner and outer being, his face and his soul, in order to reproduce him as he actually was. . . ' (p. 86). What we should like to know is whether the novelist succeeded in doing these things or not. The most the critic does is to declare that the writer has drawn 'an arresting picture of the gradual awakening of Caspar's consciousness, his first recognition of environment, of self and other beings. . . ' and has given 'a masterly exposition' which 'presents an untouched human soul' (p. 101). This is, undoubtedly, what Wassermann intended to do, as he explicitly stated on more than one occasion, but much could be said in support of a contradictory view. We know that on completion of the novel the author passed through hours of exaltation which were followed by hours of despair. There seems to have been a measure of justification for the latter; nowhere, as it seems to the present writer, has his 'Kunst der Unwirklichkeit' betrayed him more.

Thomas Mann, in a kindly survey of Wassermann's work, aptly said that his novels were 'zu romanhaft'; and the latter's intimate friend, Heimann, in pointing out the fundamental weakness of an early narrative, pronounced a judgement which, in our opinion, is essentially true of much of his work, even to the end: 'die geschilderten Gestalten und Ereignisse haben keine Realität an sich, sondern immer nur dem Erzähler zuliebe'. In this connexion it is significant that it was *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* rather than any other of Goethe's narrative writings which Wassermann ardently admired and desired to emulate—that novel, in which poetically creative power gave place to a desire to handle characters as the 'bearers' and exponents of ideas.

Indefatigable in his investigation of the problems of form (*Gestalt*), Wassermann took exception to the ingredient of irony as instanced in the novels of Thomas Mann because, to quote his own words, 'irony, to my mind, is tantamount to an evasion of artistic form' (cf. his article, 'Tendencies of the Modern Novel', *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1934). Yet, can there be any question which of these two will, in the opinion of posterity, represent the achievement of form in the history of the novel of their period?

These and a number of other points, equally interesting and inherent in the facts presented by this volume, are inseparable from the whole question of the significance of Wassermann's writings. We should have liked to see them critically discussed by a scholar who is so fully in command of his material as is Professor Blankenagel.

G. CRAIG HOUSTON

Studies in Honor of John Albrecht Walz. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press. 1941. 335 pp. \$3.50.

This valuable and attractive volume comprises studies 'written by former graduate students of Professor Walz at Harvard University', nearly all of whom are now prominently engaged in the teaching of German in American Universities. It is offered to him on the occasion of his seventieth birthday and his Presidency of The Modern Language Association of America and it bears eloquent witness to the esteem in which Professor Walz is held by his pupils and to the wide range of interests which he has inspired in them.

The contributions can be divided into four groups: (1) Americana in German studies; (2) German Literature; (3) German Philology; (4) Miscellaneous. In the first group we have P. A. Shelley's *Niclas Muller, German-American Poet and Patriot*, who found refuge in America in 1853 and whose *Zehn gepanzerte Sonnete* are here reproduced for the first time in the translation of the Rev. C. T. Brooks; O. W. Long's *Werther in America*, an illuminating account with due attention to the translations and imitations of, and the poetry and critical views on, Goethe's work, which fascinated and disturbed readers in America as it did those in Europe, the most noteworthy recorded reactions being those of Longfellow, John Motley and Margaret Fuller, as well as Wilmer's astonishing satire *The Sorrows of Skwerter*. In this group we also have H. W. Pfund's *George Henry Calvert, Admirer of Goethe*, a detailed account of the life, travels and writings of one of Goethe's 'staunchest protagonists in the New World and, indeed, his first American biographer'. It is interesting to compare his impressions of Goethe's personality with the Puritan strictures of his fellow-countryman and traveller in Germany, George Bancroft. Goethe's 'attitude and expression', says Calvert, as he entered the room, 'were those of an expectant naturalist, eagerly awaiting the transatlantic phenomenon'. Finally, we have in this section A. F. Buffington's *English Loan Words in Pennsylvania German*, an analysis based chiefly on the prose writings of Pumpnickle Bill, Solly Hulsbuck and Boonastiel, from which sources it is made clear that 'the percentage of English loan words in Pennsylvania German is much lower than previous writers have indicated'. Buffington also offers some general explanations of the reasons for these borrowings and makes a contribution to the deeper study of the subject, e.g. to the problem of the assignment of genders to borrowed words.

Among the essays on German Literature we have a penetrating note on *Kleist and Kant*, by I. S. Stamm, in which Kleist's spiritual crisis of 1801 is shown to be due to an 'inner confusion between his superficial unmetaphysical consciousness and his deeper metaphysical character', a new analysis of Goethe's much discussed *Auf dem See* by Walter Silz, an interesting, if rather far-fetched, interpretation of Goethe's *Lila* as a fragment of the great Confession by T. K. Brown (the explanation of the title-word by reference to the *Farbenlehre* being quite unacceptable and the identification of the figures overdone), and finally Alan Holske's *Stifter and the Biedermeier Crisis*, a careful account of the indecision and ineffectiveness in social and cultural matters of the German middle classes in the first half of the nineteenth century, as well as Stifter's changing attitude to the absorbing problem of the relative rights

and values of the individual in a shifting social world, his vaguely Romantic beginnings and ultimate idealistic, conservative creed.

In the philological section R.-M. S. Heffner contributes an essay on *Walther's use of Konnen und Mögen* in which he investigates the probable meanings of these words, as used by Walther, and comes to the conclusion that the former word was 'only beginning to make notable encroachments upon the fields of meaning' proper to the latter—a conclusion adequately supported by statistical evidence based on the hypothetical meanings of the words treated. The statistical method is again employed by G. J. Metcalf in his study on *Abstractions as Forms of Address in Fifteenth-Century German* in explaining the use of plural forms of the words *gnade* and *lieffde*, and the third person pronominal forms accompanying these abstractions in an address. He traces the plural forms in the nominative and accusative cases to their genitive and dative forms, and the association of third person pronominal forms with them, to the influence of demonstrative pronouns regularly employed in conjunction with these forms of address. A striking result of Metcalf's investigation is the 'unique position of the ducal family and chancellery of Cleves in its use of the plural forms of *lieffde*'. A highly developed form of the statistical method is to be found in W. F. Twaddell's *Functional Burdening of Stressed Vowels in German* in which philological reasoning borders on the mathematical and promises to develop into a totally new branch of the discipline. More traditional methods characterize A. Taylor's *Zwischen Pfingsten und Strassburg* in which the treatment of this curious phrase meaning either 'never' or 'nowhere' raises interesting psychological problems, and W. P. von Schmertzling's *Mittelhochdeutsche Jägerwörter vom Hund*, a useful account showing the wealth and precision of M.H.G. vocabulary in the sphere of hunting.

The remaining two essays of the volume are miscellaneous in content. C. F. Barnason contributes an article on *Early Danish and Swedish Writers on Native History*, an account of nationalist rivalry in fanciful historiography, and Fred O. Nolte writes on *Art and Reality*, an important and distinguished essay on a fundamental problem in aesthetics. The author's point of view is perhaps most trenchantly put in a note: 'The aesthetic content is *distinctive* but not *detached*, *unrepresentative* but not *unrelated*. Practically the whole quarrel about *l'art pour l'art* derives from the failure to make these distinctions. Art is, at no time, strictly *representative* of anything except itself; but, at all times, it is very definitely *related* to something else—in fact, to everything in the realm of significant experience.' Utilizing this principle, the author is able to speak boldly on three perennial questions: the dramatic unities, the adherence of tragedy to history, and the principle of imitation.

It is a pleasure in reviewing this volume, rich in content, to add one's congratulations, however belatedly, to its distinguished recipient.

E. L. STAHL

SHORT NOTICES

It is tempting for the reviewer of such a work as *Anti-Dictator* (the *Discours sur la servitude volontaire* of Étienne de la Boétie, rendered into English by HARRY KURZ. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1942. xxii+54 pp. 6s. 6d.), published at such a time as this, to review not the translation but the original and to discuss the noble if impracticable doctrine that it expounds. That such a version should be made at the present time is less surprising than that the rise of totalitarian tyrannies has not produced one earlier. The dedication of this volume is to all lovers of freedom and particularly to 'peoples in all totalitarian countries today who dare not freely declare their thought'. One may doubt if 'this call to freedom' will reach them and if it is really 'not too much to assert that, if this four-hundred-year-old essay could be placed in the hands of the oppressed peoples of our day, they would find a sure way to a rebirth of freedom, a manifestation of a new spirit that would almost automatically obliterate the obscurantist strutters who today throttle their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness'.

The translation, which is based on the manuscript (839) of the Bibliothèque Nationale, formerly in the possession of Henri de Mesmes, to whom Montaigne dedicated some of La Boétie's literary remains and to whom Montaigne may have entrusted the manuscript, is a good one both in accuracy and in style. Some will accept with difficulty certain of the paragraph headings inserted by the translator: 'No fifth columnists in Greece' (p. 23), 'Why Führers make speeches' (p. 35), 'The Nazi-Jap-Fascista strangle-hold' (p. 43), 'Miseries of the stooges' (p. 46) and the like, but there are no excessive modernizations in the translation itself.

The introduction is clear, concise and readable; it deals with the life and personality of La Boétie, his friendship with Montaigne, the circumstances of the publication of the *Contr'Un* and its interpretation. There is no room for a full consideration of the controversy about the authenticity, date of composition and other problems concerning the original, nor is such a treatment necessary to the translator's purpose, but he accepts the Montaigne account as substantially true and La Boétie's work as 'a literary essay inspired by his Greek and Latin studies and conceived in the nature of a tribute to the classical spirit' and as having no immediate pretext. He also faithfully records the use and abuse of the document as a political pamphlet by the warring sects.

Like most American publications, the volume is pleasantly produced. The footnotes are clear and useful for the general reader. There is only one small misprint to note (Macrinus for Macrinus, note 53, foot of p. 51). To sum up, here is a good, sound and eminently readable little book, whose topical trimmings may be found stimulating by some, if amusing by others, but bringing vividly before the reader the lofty ideals and infectious enthusiasm of one of the most highly idealized figures of the French Renaissance.

H. W. LAWTON

Now that it is so difficult to buy French editions, even of standard authors, students and teachers will welcome two texts just added to the new Cambridge series of reprints (Verlaine: *Sagesse*. xii+50 pp. 3s. 6d.; and Heredia: *Les Trophées*. xv+96 pp. 5s. Cambridge: University Press. Both edited by F. W. Stokoe). In a three-page introduction to the first of these the editor recounts the life of Verlaine down to the affray with Rimbaud and the resulting imprisonment and conversion. The introduction to the Heredia volume gives no biographical information or even dates, which is as it should be, since such circumstances have no intimate connexion with the text, but reviews the matter of the *Trophées* and suggests one or two lines of thought about the poet's technique. It is to be hoped that these cheap but attractively produced texts are heralds of a long series, for there is a big gap waiting to be filled.

L. W. TANCOCK

LONDON

Mr J. W. Barker's odd title for his selection of Góngora—*Poesías: Polifemo, Soledades and Other Poems* (Cambridge: University Press. 1942. xxxi+118 pp. 6s.)—and such judgements as 'Systems of law, religion, government, and similarity of language made it reasonable to form new words on a Latin model rather than on, say, Choctaw, Chinese or Congolese', induce a momentary hesitation before welcoming this latest contribution to the scanty supply of advanced Spanish texts published in England. Unannotated, the *Soledades* is perhaps strong meat for the English reader, the more so as the difficulty in obtaining Spanish editions obviously extends also to Spanish commentaries. Fortunately, Mr E. M. Wilson's masterly translation, *Solitudes of Góngora* (Cambridge, 1931)—the only contribution from this country to Mr Barker's brief bibliography—is available to help fill the gap. Mr Barker arranges his twenty poems chronologically—the date has been omitted from the last, a sonnet—to facilitate a critical assessment of Góngora's worth and of the development of *gongorismo*. The introduction considers Góngora as a typically Spanish poet, a cultivator of traditional and Renaissance themes, and a Baroque poet in contrast and ornament, and gives a useful survey of the more mechanical aspects of his style. It is not perhaps adequately directed to explaining why he is a great poet.

W. C. ATKINSON

GLASGOW

In his Philip Maurice Deneke lecture, *Goethe on Nature and on Science* (Cambridge: University Press. 1942. 32 pp. 1s. 6d.), Sir Charles Sherrington, O.M., appreciates Goethe's work in the natural sciences and expounds his view of nature from the fullness of his own knowledge and insight. Goethe was for the most part, he thinks, a careful and patient observer, equipped with a wide knowledge of physics and biology, but he had certain fixed ideas and ill-founded theories which seriously limited the value of his scientific work, in particular a marked distaste for mathematics and a tendency towards enthusiastic generalizations based rather on intuition than on experiment. His versatility, in fact, had its drawbacks. This poet-scientist lacked, according to Sir Charles, the sublime detachment, the passionless urge, of the great scientific thinkers.

These views are supported by a critical analysis in non-technical terms of Goethe's *Farbenlehre* and of his work in botany and zoology. As a scientist, Sir Charles naturally likes his science neat. He objects to the intrusion of feeling into such studies, just as the historian rejects novelistic history. And he finds Goethe's view of nature 'alien to modernity', intoxicated by the vision of nature's fertility to the point of lack of pity. 'He is blind to Nature's broadcast sowing of suffering.' 'The cancer growing! Ein freundliches Spiel?' ('Mit allen treibt sie ein freundliches Spiel'—from the much disputed *Fragment on Nature*, of which Sir Charles makes perhaps excessive use).

Yet one might say that there is something almost Nietzschean, and in some ways by no means unmodern, in German eyes at least, in Goethe's zest for life, as here described, and it is not everyone, at this moment in history, who would regret, with Sir Charles, the absence in Goethe of any conception 'of an evolution which seems—and not least in evolving man—to display a trend, not merely towards new shape and greater complexity, but *upward*'. On this and other points the lecture challenges discussion, for its necessarily brief treatment of central elements in Goethe's thought leaves no room for qualifying statements. About Goethe's opposition to Newton (i.e. to the Aufklärung who swore by him?), his sense of the mystery of life, his idea of the Urphänomen and of Metamorphosis, and his pantheism, whole libraries have been written, and it would be unreasonable to expect to find the last word about them in a single lecture, but even on well-worn themes Sir Charles has something definite and stimulating to say.

W. H. BRUFORD

EDINBURGH

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

I hope you will allow me space to say that the essay on *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St Thomas More*, noticed on p. 235 of the April 1942 issue of *M.L.R.*, was not 'reprinted' because the author overestimated its importance. Half of the essay appeared in the *Revue Belge* in 1939; but before the other half could be published Belgium was at war, and as a consequence it seemed likely that publication would be held up for a very long time. In order to fulfil an academic requirement, my essay had to be printed within a certain time limit. Hence I had no choice but to print the whole essay in book form. Scholars may—and do—differ on the question of its merits; but the circumstances of publication ought to be explained, since misunderstanding of them affects judgement of the work, apparently.

C. R. THOMPSON

ITHACA. NEW YORK

NEW PUBLICATIONS

July—September 1942

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

Polish Science and Learning, 1, ed. by The Association of Polish University Professors and Lecturers in Great Britain. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.

Stanford Studies in Language and Literature, 1941, ed. by Hardin Craig. Stanford University, California.

Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley by his Colleagues. St Louis, Washington University.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Portuguese

HIGGINS, M. H., and C. F. S. DE WINTON, Survey of Education in Portugal. London, George Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.

French

(b) *Old French*

MARIE DE FRANCE, Fables, sel. and ed. by A. Ewert and R. C. Johnston. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s. 6d.

SILVER, M., Girbert de Mes, According to MS. B. New York, Columbia University. [Diss.]

(c) *Modern French*

ENGEL, C.-E., Jean François de Boissy (1704-1754). Neuchâtel, secrétariat de l'Université. 4 Sw. fr.

PRÉVOST, A. F., Manon Lescaut, ed. F. C. Green. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.

STEWART, H. F., Pascal's Apology for Religion. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

VOLTAIRE, Candide, ed. by O. R. Taylor. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

ARNCLIFFE, T., A Better Spelling. Wakefield, The Eagle Press. 2s.

CHAMBERS, R. W., Poets and their Critics: Langland and Milton (Warton Lecture on English Poetry, 1941). London, Oxford Univ. Press, for the British Academy. 3s. 6d.

CRAIGIE, Sir W. A., Some Anomalies of Spelling (S.P.E. Tract, XIX). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.

DOBREE, B., The Unacknowledged Legislator. Conversations on Literature and Politics in a Warden's Post, 1941 (P.E.N. Books). London, Allen and Unwin. 2s.

ELIOT, T. S., The Classics and the Man of Letters. Presidential Address delivered to the Classical Association. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 8d.

Everyman's English Dictionary, ed. by D. G. Browning. London, Dent. 3s.

LUCAS, F. L., Critical Thoughts in Critical Days (P.E.N. Books). London, Allen and Unwin. 2s.

POTTLE, F. A., The Idiom of Poetry. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.

WILSON, E., N. FOERSTER, J. C. RANSOM, W. H. AUDEN, The Intent of the Critic, ed. by D. A. Stauffer. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- AELFRIC, *De Temporibus Anni*, ed. by H. Henel (E.E.T.S., 213). London, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
- Epistle of Othea to Hector, The, ed. by J. D. Gordon. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- McJIMSEY, R. B., *Chaucer's Irregular -e*. New York, King's Crown Press; London, Oxford Univ. Press. 13s. 6d.
- SEVERS, J. B., *The Literary Relationships of Chaucer's Clerkes Tale*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s. 6d.

(c) *Modern English.*

- ALLEMAN, G. S., *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy*. Wallingford, Pa., published by author. \$2 00.
- BLUNDEN, E., *Romantic Poetry and the Fine Arts* (Warton Lecture on English Poetry, 1942). London, Oxford Univ. Press, for the British Academy. 1s. 6d.
- BRONTE, E. J., *The Complete Poems of*, ed. by C. W. Hatfield. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- BUTTERWORTH, C. C., *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible, 1340-1611*. Philadelphia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s. 6d.
- CHAPMAN, G., *The Poems of*, ed. by P. B. Bartlett. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer., London, Oxford Univ. Press. 30s.
- CLARK, E. G., *Raleigh and Marlowe. A Study in Elizabethan Fustian*. New York, Fordham Univ. Press. \$4.00.
- DODDS, J. W., *Thackeray: A Critical Portrait*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 20s.
- GAUDIN, L. S., *Les Lettres anglaises dans l'Encyclopédie*. New York, Columbia University. [Diss.]
- GORDON, G. S., *Anglo-American Literary Relations*, ed. by R. W. Chapman. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 5s.
- HENSON, H. H., *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life. Vol. I, 1863-1920*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 16s.
- JOHNSON, E. D., *Francis Bacon's Cypher Signatures*. Birmingham, Cornish Brothers. 3s. 6d.
- KELLEY, M., *The Great Argument. A study of Milton's De Doctrina Christiana as a Gloss upon Paradise Lost*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 30s.
- LEWIS, B. R., *The Shakespeare Documents. Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations and Commentary*. 2 vols. Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. £12. 12s.
- LEWIS, C. S., *A Preface to Paradise Lost*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- MORGAN, W. T., *Bibliography of British History, 1700-15, Vol. iv*. Bloomington, Indiana.
- MORGAN, W. T. and C. S., *Bibliography of British History, 1700-15, Vol. v. Supplements and Index to Vols. i-iii*. Bloomington, Indiana.
- NEEDLER, G. H., *The Lone Shieling. Origin and Authorship of the Blackwood 'Canadian Boat-Song'*. Toronto and Oxford Univ. Presses. 8s. 6d.
- PICK, J., *Gerard Manley Hopkins, Priest and Poet*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- POE, E. A., *The Raven and Other Poems*, ed. by T. O. Mabbott (Facsimile Text Society, 56). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.
- PROUTY, C. T., *George Gascoigne: Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier and Poet*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s.
- ROSENFELD, S., *Strolling Players. Drama in the Provinces*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.
- SCARFE, F., *Auden and After. The Liberation of Poetry, 1930-41*. London, Routledge. 8s. 6d.
- STARR, H. W., *Gray as a Literary Critic*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania. [Diss.]
- STRAUS, R., *Sala: The Portrait of an Eminent Victorian*. London, Constable. 18s.
- WOOLF, V., *The Death of the Moth*. London, Hogarth Press. 9s.

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1942

(Incorporating the American Transactions for the Year to 8 September 1942)

Dr. 1941 £	EXPENDITURE			1941			INCOME			Cr.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
To Printing, Stationery, Postages, Travel- ling Expenses, etc.	22	21	19	8			By Subscriptions					
Do. (American Expenses) (including	26	52	6	2			General	103	0	11
Air Mail on Bibliography £38. 2. 3)							American Members	156	6	5
Do. (American Expenses)	69	68	13	6								
Do. (American Expenses)	2	1	4	9			Bibliography			259	7	4
							Sales (vols. I-XIX)	14	18	7
Bibliography							Year's Work in Modern Language					
Binding and distribution. Vols. I-XIX (no publication 1942) ...	8						Studies					
Year's Work in Modern Language							Sales (vols. I-X)	3	12	10
Studies							Advertisements			
Distribution, etc. (Vols. I-X) (no publication 1942)	20						Bulletins and Indexes					
Bulletins and Indexes							Sales			
Printing	4						Interest on Bank Deposit	4	0	
Modern Language Review							'Work in Progress',	5	15	7
Deficit per Account attached	30						Modern Language Review					
Surplus for year carried to Balance Sheet...							Surplus per Account attached	12	15	5
	113											
£294										£296	18	9

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BALANCE SHEET 30 SEPTEMBER 1942

LIABILITIES				ASSETS		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
<i>Capital Account</i>						
At 30 September 1941...	...	502	10 6		856	3 3
Add: Donations received during year	...	12	6		52	16 4
						908 19 7
<i>Subscriptions in suspense</i>						
Bibliography	...	86	10 0			
Year's Work	...	48	8 6			
						211 19 1
<i>Sundry Creditors</i>						
Cambridge University Press	...	200	0 0		63	5 5
For printing <i>Modern Language Review</i>	...	3	13 6			
Audit Fee	...			144	11 0	
				200	0 0	
						344 11 0
<i>Income and Expenditure Account</i>						
Balance—Surplus per contra	...	281	5 7		281	5 7
						2 1 11
						£1123 0 7

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT

I have prepared the above Balance Sheet after examination of the books, records and vouchers relating thereto. I have not seen any evidence in support of the American receipts and payments and have accepted the statement submitted by the American Secretary. I have confirmed the bank balances by direct reference to the Banks in England and America. I certify that in my opinion this Balance Sheet shows the true and correct position of the Modern Humanities Research Association at 30 September 1942.

(Signed) L. SCRIVENER
Incorporated Accountant.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
19 November 1942.

BLAKE AND SWITZERLAND

Few English writers have suffered more from those that sought to explain them than Blake. Some commentators, having failed to understand his works, take the easy course of classing him as an inspired madman.¹ Others, more learned, attribute to him all kinds of esoteric wisdom with which he could not possibly have been acquainted.² As against these, we may claim with confidence that few men were as sane and realistic in outlook as Blake, and that his works are not beyond the wit of man to comprehend, provided that we avoid the common error of reading our own preoccupations into them. The commentators have in general been too concerned with tracing Cabbalistic and other obscure influences to realize the superficiality of the traditional view that Blake was completely isolated from his contemporaries. Hence the relation of Blake, both as an artist and as a thinker, to his age has often been strangely misunderstood. Most English critics make the mistake of classing Blake with Burns as a precursor of romanticism,³ whereas he was the chief English protagonist of the classical revival at the end of the eighteenth century. His manner, in both painting and poetry, was essentially classical; that this has not generally been realized in the past is because Blake was first brought to the public notice by the neo-romantics of the late nineteenth century, and also because too much attention has been paid to the *Poetical Sketches*, which are little more than pastiches. Again, and this is the point which I wish here to enlarge upon, the considerable debt that Blake owed to Switzerland has never been made sufficiently clear.

It must of course be stated at once that Blake's most important teacher by far was Swedenborg. He was brought up as a Swedenborgian,⁴ and up to 1787 remained entirely within the limits of Swedenborgianism, whence he derived his anti-intellectualism and, above all, the idea of correspondence.⁵ The latter

¹ This attitude survives as late as 1926, in *William Blake*, by Osbert Burdett.

² E.g. *The Real Blake*, by E. J. Ellis, and *On the Minor Prophecies of William Blake*, by Emily Hamblen. These explanations of Blake are more incomprehensible than the original text.

³ E.g. 'The whole temper of his genius was essentially opposed to the classical tradition, with its close regard to the intellectual appeal and its distrust of enthusiasm' (J. P. R. Wallis, in *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.* vol. XI, p. 201).

⁴ How Blake's father, a London hosier, came into contact with Swedenborgianism is not known, since it was not until the year of his death that the new sect began to be organized. I refer to the Theosophical Society, founded in 1784, which included Blake's friend John Flaxman among its earliest members. The process of translating Swedenborg's works into English was slow: one of the earliest translations was *Heaven and Hell* (1778). In 1789, the names of William and Catherine Blake appear in the minute-book of the Great Eastcheap Swedenborgian Society. This is evidently 'the society' referred to in the annotations to *Divine Love and Wisdom* (see the Keynes one-volume edition of Blake's works, p. 943). For information on the diffusion of Swedenborg's doctrines, see Robert Hindmarsh, *The Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church* (1861). Through the missionary endeavours of the Rev. John Clowes (1743-1831), Lancashire soon became, as it has since remained, the chief stronghold of Swedenborgianism.

⁵ See *Heaven and Hell*, paras. 87-115.

may be briefly stated as the view that what Blake calls the 'human form divine' is the archetype of all forms whatsoever. Every sphere of reality is analogous to the Threefold Human, and Man in his turn is made in the image of the Threefold Divine. This non-logical method of interpreting reality forms the basis of all Blake's thought after the illumination of 1787. Swedenborg found correspondences between the planes of existence; Blake went a step further and identified them. The idea of the Threefold Human is also the key to most of Blake's prophetic books, which are constructed according to a system of threefold symbolism on the model of the Bible as interpreted by Swedenborg.¹

The revelation of 1787 was ultimate and original; it was a vision of the Infinite without and the Infinite within, and of the perfect self-enjoyment of the Infinite. But, though it was an original and irreducible experience, it was, as we shall see, nourished and interpreted by a certain tendency in contemporary thought. The impact of this experience upon Blake's Swedenborgian upbringing led to both a contraction and an expansion of outlook. It involved a contraction in the sense of a rejection of conventional dualism and therefore of religious revelation. So, from one point of view, Blake had much in common with his friend Tom Paine. But the interpretation of the supernatural in terms of the natural was for him merely a preliminary to re-interpreting the natural in terms of Spirit. In order to do this, he made use of the idea that Man might have latent senses over and above the normal five or, alternatively, that the five senses might be expanded so as to take in larger portions of reality. He derived this argument from Charles Bonnet,² who expounded it in a pamphlet³ translated by John Wesley in 1787. This pamphlet also formed the basis of Lessing's *Daß mehr als fünf Sinne für den Menschen sein können* (1780).⁴ In his pamphlet, Bonnet starts out from the doctrine of personal immortality, and inquires what the condition of souls in the next world will be. He admits that all knowledge is derived from the senses,⁵ and argues that the transition from this world to the next will be accompanied by an improvement or expansion of the faculties.⁶ This improvement of the senses will take the form of an increase either in their number or in their sensitivity.⁷ Just as light

¹ For a concise statement of Swedenborg's exegetical method, see *Arcana Coelestia*, paras. 1-5.

² Charles Bonnet (1720-93) was a native of Geneva. He was originally a naturalist, and his work on botany and embryology earned the praise of Cuvier. Having impaired his sight by the use of the microscope, he turned to philosophy. He is remembered chiefly by his theory of palinogenesis.

³ *Conjectures concerning the Nature of Future Happiness*, Dublin, 1787. In a prefatory note, Wesley calls it 'one of the most sensible Tracts I ever read'.

⁴ *Sämtliche Schriften*, ed. Lachmann, 1857, vol. XI, part II, pp. 64-7.

⁵ Bonnet, 'The senses are the first source of all our knowledge' (op. cit. Section 3). Blake, 'The true method of knowledge is experiment', *All Religions are One* (Keynes ed. p. 148).

⁶ Cf. Blake, 'The whole creation will be consumed and appear infinite and holy, whereas it now appears finite and corrupt. This will come to pass by an improvement of sensual enjoyment' (*The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, Keynes ed. p. 197).

⁷ Bonnet, 'Two principal means may perfect, in the world to come, all the faculties of man, viz. senses more exquisite, and new senses' (loc. cit.).

corresponds to sight, and sound to hearing, so electricity, magnetism and many other phenomena may have latent senses corresponding to them.¹ This, it is suggested, is not an absurd speculation, since, if one only possessed four senses, one would have no conception of a fifth.² This, then, is the argument as stated by Bonnet, Lessing, Blake and several other writers of the eighteenth century.³ Bonnet's idea of palingenesis and Lessing's idea of metempsychosis represent attempts to refurbish sensualism in the interests of religion.

The idea that Man might possess latent senses over and above the usual five is expressed in the *Visions of the Daughters of Albion* (1793):

Thou knowest that the ancient trees seen by thine eyes have fruit,
But knowest thou that trees and fruits flourish upon the earth
To gratify senses unknown? trees, beasts and birds unknown:
Unknown, not unperceived, spread in the infinite microscope,
In places yet unvisited by the voyager, and in worlds
Over another kind of seas, and in atmospheres unknown.

(lines 99-104)

But this is an isolated case; usually Blake is concerned only with the idea of an expansion of the existing senses. For him, Heaven is the state in which Man is able to expand or contract his senses at will. The theological implications of this are explained in *Jerusalem*:

We live as One Man, for contracting our infinite senses
We behold multitude, or expanding we behold as one,
As One Man all the Universal Family, and that One Man
We call Jesus the Christ. (Bk. II, plate 38, lines 17-20)

The idea is stated in more characteristically Blakean terms as follows:

There is a limit of Opaqueness and a limit of Contraction
In every Individual Man, and the limit of Opaqueness
Is named Satan, and the limit of Contraction is named Adam.

But there is no limit of Expansion, there is no limit of Translucence
In the bosom of Man for ever from eternity to eternity.

(*Jerusalem*. Bk. II, plate 42, lines 29-36)

Again and again in Blake's works we find detailed descriptions of the Fall,

when the five senses whelm'd
In deluge o'er the earth-born man; then turn'd the fluxile eyes
Into two stationary orbs, concentrating all things.
The ever-varying spiral ascents to the heavens of heavens
Were bended downward, and the nostrils' golden gates shut,
Turn'd outward, barr'd and petrified against the infinite. (*Europe*, ll. 80-5)

But here again, as in the case of Swedenborg, Blake carries Bonnet's arguments very much further. These arguments, which for Bonnet and Lessing represented a purely speculative attempt to fit the Infinite into the framework of empiricism,

¹ Cf. Lessing, 'Jedes Staubchen der Materie kann einer Seele zu einem Sinn dienen. Das ist, die ganze materielle Welt ist bis in ihre kleinsten Teile beseelt' (op. cit. para. 13).

² Cf. Blake, 'From a perception of only three senses or three elements, none could deduce a fourth or fifth' (*There is No Natural Religion*, Keynes ed. p. 147). Lessing, 'Wenn wir nur vier Sinne hatten, und der Sinn des Gesichts uns fehlte, so wurden wir uns von diesem eben so wenig einen Begriff machen können, als von einem sechsten Sinne' (op. cit. para. 22).

³ E.g. Leibniz and Mylius, see Oehlke, *Lessing und seine Zeit*, vol. II, pp. 459-61; cf. also Voltaire, *Micromégas*, chap. II.

were for Blake intellectual interpretations of an immediate, personal experience of a mystical character. This, as I have pointed out, was an experience of the Infinite within as well as of the Infinite without,¹ and this meant that half-measures like metempsychosis could not satisfy him. Blake steps right through the 'veil of Appearing' and blends Bonnet, Swedenborg and Berkeley into a form of idealism which interprets God and Nature as aspects of Man.

It is sometimes suggested that Blake's ideas on the senses have a Platonic flavour, especially in the form in which they are expressed in *Europe*:

Five windows light the cavern'd Man: through one he breathes the air,
Through one hears music of the spheres, through one the eternal vine
Flourishes that he may receive the grapes, through one can look
And see small portions of the eternal world that ever groweth,
Through one himself pass out what time he please.²

The idea of pre-natal existence implied in *The Book of Thel* may also, it is suggested, indicate a Platonic influence, perhaps through the eccentric Platonist, Thomas Taylor.³ However, the passage I have quoted from *Europe* may also have a Cabbalistic basis; in the *Zohar* the brain is said to be encased in a shell in which are cracks, which are the senses.⁴ We may speak with more confidence of a Platonic influence in the major prophecies, which were written when Blake's views on aesthetics had become crystallized, and he had realized the pre-eminent importance of form or outline. For example:

Whatever can be Created can be Annihilated: Forms cannot:
The Oak is cut down by the Axe, the Lamb falls by the Knife,
But their Forms Eternal Exist Forever. Amen. Hallelujah!
(Milton, plate 35, lines 36-8)

The first important event in Blake's intellectual life after the illumination of 1787 was his reading of Lavater's *Aphorisms on Man*.⁵ There were numerous reasons for his reading this unimportant little book with so much care. It was he who had engraved the frontispiece for the English translation by his friend Fuseli, published in 1788. Moreover, Fuseli (Heinrich Füssli) had been a schoolfellow of Lavater at Zürich, at the Collegium Carolinum where Bodmer and Breitinger were professors. Another habitué of the radical circle which

¹ Blake, 'The desire of Man being Infinite, the possession is Infinite and himself Infinite' (*There is No Natural Religion*, Keynes ed. p. 148). Lessing, 'Die Seele ist ein einfaches Wesen, welches unendlicher Vorstellungen fähig ist' (op. cit. para. 1).

² *Europe*, Keynes ed. p. 232. Miss Hamblen characteristically scorns the obvious interpretation of the 'five windows' as the senses, and evolves a complex and quite arbitrary explanation (op. cit. p. 231).

³ Thomas Taylor (1758-1835), friend of Peacock, Romney, Flaxman and Mary Wollstonecraft, was a translator and expositor of classical thinkers. Somewhat of a fanatic, he was rumoured to have espoused polytheism and the doctrine of metempsychosis. His translations include Plato, Plotinus, Porphyry and the Orphic hymns. He wrote dissertations on the Eleusinian mysteries, Aristotle's philosophy, and classical mathematics. He appears in Blake's satire *An Island in the Moon*, as Sipsop the Pythagorean.

⁴ 'Quae quasi fenestrae sunt; vocantur in illo aures, oculi, nasus et os' (Rosenroth's translation, quoted by Prof. Saurat in his *Blake and Modern Thought*).

⁵ The original title was *Vermischte unphysiognomische Regeln zur Selbst- und Menschenkenntnis* (1788). The book was dedicated to Fuseli.

met at the house of the publisher Johnson,¹ a circle which included Blake, Fuseli, Paine, Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft and Priestley, was Thomas Holcroft,² a radical politician and a prolific writer of comedies and novels. Besides writing the most popular melodrama of the period, *The Road to Ruin*, Holcroft also made the first translation of the *Physiognomische Fragmente*.³ So, in spite of his ignorance of German, Blake may well have had a good deal of second-hand information about German ideas generally and those of Lavater in particular.

Blake and Lavater had much in common; the basic trends of their thought were largely the same, though Blake, as usual, was far bolder in drawing conclusions. Lavater had been deeply influenced by his compatriots, Bonnet and Rousseau; in addition, he was acquainted with the writings of Swedenborg, and corresponded with their author. His interest in physiognomy rested upon a somewhat crude interpretation of the doctrine of correspondences. He also had been impressed by Young's revitalization of the old cliché of genius as a divine inflowing. His rejection of rationalism, the stress he laid on the senses, his incipient tendency to fuse God and Man, his belief in genius as the divine element in Man—all these are timid anticipations of Blake's more audacious thought. Several of the best-known epigrams in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* are obviously based on passages of Lavater.⁴

¹ Joseph Johnson (1738–1809), a native of Liverpool, came to London in 1752 and was apprenticed to a bookseller. In 1770 he set up on his own account in St Paul's Churchyard. There he remained until his death, except for an interlude in 1797, when he was imprisoned for nine months for publishing a seditious pamphlet. He published for Priestley, Cowper, Erasmus Darwin, Horne Tooke, Fuseli and Mary Wollstonecraft.

² Thomas Holcroft (1745–1809) was successively a stableboy at Newmarket, a cobbler, a touring actor and a journalist. In spite of his early poverty, he managed to acquire an adequate knowledge of French, German and Italian. In 1784 he translated *Le Mariage de Figaro*, playing the part of Figaro himself at Covent Garden. In 1794, along with Hardy, Thelwall, Horne Tooke and other radicals, he was tried for treason, though acquitted, his career was ruined. His numerous translations from French and German include a version of *Hermann und Dorothea* (1801).

³ *Essays on Physiognomy, for the Promotion of the Knowledge and the Love of Mankind*. Written in the German Language by J. C. Lavater, and translated into English by Thomas Holcroft. Printed for G. G. J. and J. Robinson, London, 1789. It was a direct translation from the condensed version of the *Fragments* by J. M. Armbruster (1783–6). The illustrations were engraved by Blake. In her *German Literature in England, 1750–1830*, Miss Stockley observes that she could not find this translation. There is in fact a copy in the Reference Library, Manchester.

⁴ The following examples illustrate clearly the wonderful conciseness of Blake's style:

(i) Lavater: 'He who hates the wisest and best of men, hates the Father of men: for where is the Father of men to be seen but in the most perfect of his children?' (*Aphorisms on Man*, no. 549). Blake: 'The worship of God is: Honouring his gifts in other men, each according to his genius, and loving the greatest men best' (Keynes ed. p. 202).

(ii) Lavater: 'Each particle of matter is an immensity, each leaf a world; each insect an unexplicable compendium' (*Fragments*, transl. Holcroft, vol. I, chap. 3). Blake: 'To create a little flower is the labour of ages' (56th *Proverb of Hell*, Keynes ed. p. 194. See also *Auguries of Innocence*, lines 1–4).

(iii) Lavater: 'To force a man to think and feel like me is equal to forcing him to have my exact forehead and nose; and to impart unto the eagle the slowness of the snail, and to the snail the swiftness of the eagle' (*Fragments*, transl. Holcroft, vol. I, chap. 20). Blake: 'The eagle never lost so much time as when he submitted to learn of the crow' (39th *Proverb of Hell*, Keynes ed. p. 194).

(iv) Lavater: 'Truth must be acknowledged as truth, if it be expressed with sufficient precision, if it be sufficiently separated, simplified and illustrated. Man must receive truth with irrefragable conviction when it is presented to him unclouded, unmixed, unadulterated' (*Fragments*, transl. Holcroft, vol. II, chap. 3). Blake: 'Truth can never be told so as to be understood, and not be believed' (69th *Proverb of Hell*, Keynes ed. p. 195).

The actual influence of Lavater on Blake was twofold. He confirmed Blake's sense of the importance of Minute Particulars,¹ which was an essential feature of the original experience of 1787. We cannot therefore blame Lavater for the contradiction between this romantic philosophy and Blake's essentially classical method in poetry and design. Lavater also confirmed Blake's conception of a positive morality, which again was inseparable from the revelation of 1787. But, as in the case of Swedenborg and Bonnet, Blake went far beyond his master and asserted the essential goodness of the instinctive impulse. It is at this period that we find the first traces of his cult of sexual enjoyment as an earthly exemplar of the Infinite Joy which is Eternity.² He even maintained that 'Active Evil is better than Passive Good', a view which is nearer to Nietzsche than to Lavater. Like Swedenborg, Lavater never ventured far away from orthodoxy. Moreover, there was in him nothing corresponding to what I have called the element of contraction, which gave Blake an affinity with the freethinkers of his day. Blake had a fundamental sanity and a critical faculty which Lavater lacked.

I have mentioned Rousseau in passing, but it is almost impossible to determine whether Blake was influenced by him or not. It was not until late in life that Blake learned a little French, and it is not known whether he ever read anything of Rousseau's. Fuseli once wrote a pamphlet defending Rousseau against Voltaire, and Blake may have acquired some notions about Rousseau from the better-informed members of the Johnson circle. In such allusions as occasionally appear in his works, Voltaire and Rousseau are invariably mentioned together as though their views were identical. Thus, in *The French Revolution* (1791) he speaks of the French priests,

Driven out by the fiery cloud of Voltaire, and thund'rous rocks of Rousseau.

(line 277)

Here he approves of Voltaire and Rousseau as prophets of the Revolution, but after he had lost faith in political revolution as a means to spiritual progress, his attitude changed. At Felpham he wrote:

Mock on, mock on, Voltaire, Rousseau:

Mock on, mock on: 'tis all in vain!

You throw the sand against the wind,

And the wind blows it back again.

(Keynes ed. p. 107)

Here he is attacking Voltaire and Rousseau for their 'natural religion'. Again, in *Milton* we read:

How is this thing, this Newtonian phantasm,

This Voltaire and Rousseau, this Hume and Gibbon and Bolingbroke,

This Natural Religion, this impossible absurdity? (Plate 46, lines 11-13)

These quotations do not suggest that Blake's knowledge of Rousseau amounted to much more than vague hearsay. The fact that both Blake and Rousseau

¹ See *Aphorisms on Man*, no. 532, and Blake's important annotation (Keynes ed. p. 923).

² I.e. the final annotation on the *Aphorisms on Man* (Keynes ed. p. 932). Already in *An Island in the Moon* we find a satirical poem about 'Matrimony's golden cage' (Keynes ed. pp. 880-1).

looked back to a historical Golden Age means nothing since this idea is as old as thought itself. The condemnation of urban life in the fragment, *There's the bore pale desire*,¹ is merely the usual discontent of the townsman of Puritan upbringing.² Moreover, nothing could be more alien to Blake's thought than Rousseau's 'Kulturpessimismus': Blake was, before all else, the champion of art and of the artist.³ Rightly or wrongly, it was his unchanging belief that the greatness of England depended, not on constitutions or on military victories, but on the flourishing of the arts within her borders. It is therefore highly doubtful whether Blake was influenced by Rousseau, except perhaps indirectly through Lavater.

'If the fool would persist in his folly, he would become wise', says the eighteenth *Proverb of Hell*, and these words might well be applied to Blake himself. He inherited the speculations of Bonnet, and the antirational method of occultism—'as above, so below'—in its Swedenborgian form. To them he added an original element in the shape of a simple and yet comprehensively significant mystical experience. He then fused these elements into an idealist metaphysic which remained constant with him throughout his life. In examining the influence of Swiss thinkers upon Blake during the decisive years of 1787 and 1788, I have also outlined the metaphysical ideas which provide the framework for the later psychological investigations, which form the most original and interesting part of his work.

J. H. MACPHAIL

SALFORD

¹ 'Alas, in cities where's the man whose face is not a mask unto his heart?' (Keynes ed. p. 864).

² In 1783, Blake engraved a frontispiece for *Memoirs of Albert de Haller*, by Thomas Henry, a member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester. But this is chiefly concerned with Haller's work as a physiologist, and contains only general references to his poems.

³ E.g. 'A Poet, a Painter, a Musician, an Architect: the Man or Woman who is not one of these is not a Christian' (*Laocoon* plate, Keynes ed. p. 764). Cf. Lavater, 'How can he be pious who loves not the beautiful, whilst piety is nothing but the love of beauty?' (*Aphorisms on Man*, no. 383).

A STUDY IN PERIODICAL PATCHWORK. JOHN WILSON'S 'RECREATIONS OF CHRISTOPHER NORTH' 1842

The irony of contemporary eulogy as compared with the neglect of posterity is a commonplace of literature. Charles Knight wrote of John Wilson in 1847:

His contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine* raised the whole tone and character of periodical literature... Some of the finest of these productions have been collected as *The Recreations of Christopher North*. It would be difficult to point to three volumes of our own times that have an equal chance of becoming immortal.¹

Seven years later, in an obituary sketch of Wilson, Harriet Martineau wrote similarly that by 1820

[he] had already done more than any one man toward raising the character of periodical literature by his marvellous contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine*, and the stimulus his genius imparted to a whole generation of writers of that class. We all know his selection from those papers—the three volumes of *Recreations of Christopher North*. There is nothing in our literature exactly like them, and we may venture to say there never will be. They are not only the most effective transcription of the moods of thought and feeling of a deeply thinking and feeling mind—a complete arresting and presentment of those moods as they pass—but an absolute realizing of the influence of Nature in a book. The scents and breezes of the moorland are fairly carried into even the sick-chamber by that book....²

Even De Quincey concludes an article entitled 'Professor Wilson' in *Hogg's Instructor* of 1850,

by saying, in a spirit of simplicity and fidelity to the truth, that from Professor Wilson's papers in *Blackwood*, but above all from his meditative examinations of great poets, Greek and English, may be formed a *florilegium* of thoughts the most profound and the most gorgeously illustrated that exist in human composition.³

One may to-day regard such judgements regretfully, whimsically, or contemptuously. The *Recreations of Christopher North* include, generally speaking, the cream of Wilson's prose, aside from the *Noctes Ambrosianae*; but they are neither unique nor immortal, and they are the production certainly of a deeply feeling but by no means of a deeply thinking mind.

However anticlimactic in comparison with the three previous quotations, the following passage has the virtue of truth. A year before his death Coleridge expressed in *Table Talk* his conviction that 'two or three volumes' collected out of *Blackwood's Magazine* by Wilson 'would be very delightful. But he must not leave it for others to do; for some recasting and much condensation would be required; and literary executors make sad work in general with their testators' brains.'⁴ The amount of 'recasting' and of 'condensation' in the *Recreations of Christopher North* has never been realized hitherto—the extraordinary changes give the volumes, quite aside from their subject-matter, a

¹ *Half-hours with the Best Authors*, II, 103.

² *Biographical Sketches* (1869), p. 23.

³ D. Masson, *The Collected Works of Thomas De Quincey* (1890), v, 301.

⁴ *The Table Talk and Omniana of S. T. Coleridge*, ed. by T. Ashe (1923), p. 221.

considerable psychological interest. I purpose, therefore, in the pages that follow to consider (1) the relation between the *Recreations* and the original articles in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and (2) the *Recreations* as literature, with special reference to Wilson's literary criticism, especially of Wordsworth.

I. THE *Recreations* AND THEIR SOURCES

(1) *Reduplication in the Recreations and in Essays*:

Critical and Imaginative

A dozen years before his death, appeared, in 1842, John Wilson's *Recreations of Christopher North*, in three volumes, from the press of Blackwood of Edinburgh. The work was republished in the same year in two volumes, and fifteen years later was republished also as volumes nine and ten of the *Works of Professor Wilson, of the University of Edinburgh, edited by his son-in-law, Professor Ferrier*, in twelve volumes, 1855-8. Ferrier apparently was quite unaware that in this edition in twelve volumes more than half-a-dozen passages appear twice over—both in the *Recreations* and in the selections from *Blackwood's Magazine* reprinted in the four volumes entitled *Essays. Critical and Imaginative*. The list of repetitions follows:

- (1) *Recreations*, I, 180-1—*Essays Critical and Imaginative*, I, 357-9 (original *Blackwood*, xxvii, 285: February 1830).
- (2) *Recreations*, I, 287-8—*Recreations*, II, 414 (original *Remarks on the Scenery of the Highlands*, 1836).
- (3) *Recreations*, I, 295-6—*Essays: Critical and Imaginative*, I, 11-12 (original *Blackwood*, xix, 379-80: April 1826).
- (4) *Recreations*, I, 379-80—*Essays Critical and Imaginative*, II, 385-6 (original *Blackwood*, xliii, 722-3: June 1838).
- (5) *Recreations*, II, 137-9—*Essays: Critical and Imaginative*, I, 132-3 (original *Blackwood*, xxi, 779-80. 11 June 1827).
- (6) *Recreations*, II, 207-8—*Essays: Critical and Imaginative*, III, 379-80 (original *Blackwood*, xxxviii, 412-13: September 1835).
- (7) *Recreations*, II, 259—*Essays. Critical and Imaginative*, II, 367 (original *Blackwood*, xliii, 707: June 1838).
- (8) *Recreations*, II, 373-4—*Essays: Critical and Imaginative*, II, 1-2 (original *Blackwood*, xxxi, 857: June 1832).¹

(2) *General points of importance*

(a) *The omission of selections from Wilson's early articles in Blackwood's Magazine before 1826.* (b) *The essentially desultory character of Wilson's genius.* The reduplication in Ferrier's volumes has been emphasized by way of intro-

¹ One example of reduplication, at least, occurs also in *Essays Critical and Imaginative*. Thus, in the first volume, pp. 4-6, two paragraphs in 'Streams' do not appear in the original 'Streams' of *Blackwood's Magazine* of April 1826, but are interpolated from 'The Great Moray Floods' of August 1830, xxviii, 147-8 and 149-50.

duction to a larger subject, the heterogeneous make-up of the *Recreations*, which have always hitherto been looked upon, erroneously, as a collection of reprinted articles from Wilson's contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine*. As a matter of fact the volumes represent instead rather a prose anthology: several of the pieces appear as they did originally in *Blackwood*, but the greater part of the *Recreations* consists of scattered passages, sometimes single paragraphs or even half-paragraphs, taken from the *Magazine* between 1826 and 1839 (vols. XIX–XLV) and thrown together in extraordinary fusion. In one instance at least a passage can be identified, which never appeared in *Maga*; and it is possible that other passages not identifiable appeared in compositions of Wilson printed elsewhere than in *Blackwood's Magazine*. The fact that not a single passage is carried over from the first eighteen volumes of *Maga*¹ to the *Recreations* of 1842 is of great interest. Wilson, responsible as much as Lockhart or Maginn for the bilgy onslaughts on the Cockneys and other victims of Tory wrath in the early years, at least kept out of these selections in maturity his unhappy and unpardonable youthful excesses. The volumes prove also—what to be sure is sufficiently obvious—the essentially desultory character of John Wilson's genius. Apparently passages written a dozen years apart may be combined as effectively in the *Recreations* as passages written in the same year or the same month. Certainly, the *Recreations of Christopher North* offer a fascinating psychological study.

(3) *Comparison of the Recreations and the originals*

Naturally Wilson employs a great many obviously transitional passages to fit his earlier writing into the new context of 1842. In *L'Envoy* (*Recreations*, II, 379) he summarizes 'the First Series of what we have chosen to call our Recreations': 'There have been much recasting and remoulding—many alterations, believed by us to have been wrought with no unskilful spirit of change—cruel, we confess, to our feelings, rejections of numerous lucubrations to their father dear—and if we may use such words, not a few new creations, in the same *genial* spirit in which we worked of old—not always unrewarded by sympathy, which is better than praise.' A certain number of additions—some half a dozen single paragraphs and three or four longer passages of from two to five pages—I am unable to identify. We may most satisfactorily explain these additions in three ways:

- (1) They may have been introduced by Wilson in 1842 as an expansion of the original context;
- (2) They may just possibly be passages that were rejected in the publication

¹ A passage on Burns and the Ettrick Shepherd occurs from February 1819 (IV, 528–9), but this passage is quoted also in a footnote to Hogg's poem 'A Greek Pastoral' of May 1830 (XXVII, 771).

of the original articles in *Blackwood*, but that have been revived by Wilson in the pride of authorship;¹

(3) They may have come from sources other than *Blackwood*—from Wilson's contributions, that is, to other periodicals or volumes.²

Probably the first explanation is sufficient. The only important 'addition', that dealing with Wilson's attitude towards Wordsworth's religious poetry, will receive consideration later.

In *Notes and Queries* of 6 June and 1 August 1942 may be found, in outline, the original passages which make up the *Recreations of Christopher North*. These tables in *Notes and Queries* should be glanced at for the sake of understanding what follows.

(4) *Extraordinary complexity of the Recreations in relation to the originals*

The intricate fashion in which Wilson has woven together his *Recreations* appears from the outlines just mentioned. It is obvious that an original article in *Blackwood's Magazine* may appear in any number of unexpected places. Even more interesting, of course, is a study of the *Recreations* themselves, with their synthesis.

'L'Envoy', which concludes the second volume of the *Recreations*, though a piece of only twelve pages yet consists of sixteen distinct passages, borrowed from eight separate articles between 1828 and 1839. The majority of the original passages, moreover, are paragraphs or half-paragraphs. On II, 273, a half-paragraph from 'Greek Anthology V', December 1833, is united with a half-paragraph from 'Our Descriptive Poetry', May 1839; and similarly on II, 379, a half-paragraph from 'Loss of our Golden Key', February 1838, is joined with a half-paragraph from 'Christopher in his Alcove', April 1839.

The long composition 'The Moors', again, *Recreations*, I, 262-389, borrows from eighteen identifiable originals. The original 'The Moors' of October 1830 furnishes fifteen passages; 'Christopher among the Mountains' of September 1838 furnishes ten passages; and the other sixteen articles furnish thirty-one passages. Altogether, the one hundred and twenty-seven pages of this com-

¹ Ferrier, in his Preface to the first volume of *Essays Critical and Imaginative*, p. v, assures us that 'separate copies of all his contributions to *Blackwood* had been made up for his use, and were in his hands some years before his death'. We know that Wilson recognized his tendency to verbosity. 'My articles are in general far too long', he wrote William Blackwood in July 1822, in one of his frequent bursts of pessimism (Mrs Oliphant, *Annals of a Publishing House* (1897), I, 273). And we know that William Blackwood admitted the fault also, and frequently pruned unsparingly—sometimes indeed omitted altogether—the contributions of his ally (Mrs Oliphant and Mrs Gordon's *Christopher North*). In 'Christopher at the Lakes', *Blackwood's Magazine*, August 1832, XXXII, 188, Wilson himself facetiously refers to his own omissions in his articles for *Maga*.

² One paragraph in the *Recreations*, I, 287-8, comes from *Remarks on the Scenery of the Highlands*, first published as Preface to *Swan's Select views of the Lakes of Scotland*, second edition, 1836. There is no reason why other 'additions' may not have some similar source. Thus the description of birds (*Recreations*, II, 112-14) is certainly as likely to exist in some undiscovered original, or to be revived from an unprinted passage or passages in an article originally submitted to *Blackwood*, as to have been added by Wilson in 1842. Similarly the suspicious looking strangers (*Recreations*, I, 318-21) and 'North's' headache and 'Tickler's' insolence (*Recreations*, I, 335-6) may be additions to the context, or may some day be traced to a now unknown original.

position are an amalgam of almost sixty separate passages. The fashion in which the amalgam is built up, moreover, deserves attention. The first three and a half pages in the *Recreations* follow the original 'The Moors' in *Blackwood*, xxviii, 575-7; then after almost thirty pages of material introduced in seventeen selections from eight separate articles ranging from 1826 to 1839, we return to the next paragraph in *Blackwood* as if nothing had intervened. The process is typical.

It is unnecessary to emphasize further the extraordinarily complex relation between the *Recreations of Christopher North* and the original articles of *Blackwood's Magazine*. But a word may be added on Wilson's procedure, which a comparison of the originals and the *Recreations* will at once explain.

In his reprint of 'Cottages', 'North' simply adds three vivid and dramatic pictures to the original 'Cottages' of *Blackwood's Magazine* of March 1826, introducing a selection from the 'Anatomy of Drunkenness', April 1828, into the narrative characterizations of the original 'Cottages', and substituting for the critical ramblings at the end of the original article a concrete story or two taken from the midst of an equally rambling affair, 'Hints for the Holidays, III', September 1826.¹

Again in 'The Moors' occurs a description of mountains called 'hills of the eagle', *Recreations*, I, 283. Immediately Wilson incorporates a paragraph on eagles, taken from 'Hints for the Holidays, III', September 1826, with the paragraphs of the original passage, 'Christopher among the Mountains', September 1838. In 'The Moors', also, occurs the casual mention of Loch Awe, *Recreations*, I, 375, from 'The Moors' of *Blackwood*, October 1830. Immediately Wilson adds three pages from an article entitled 'Loch Awe' from *Blackwood* of June 1833. Similarly a few pages later occurs, in the original 'The Moors', the phrase 'authenticity of Ossian's poems', *Recreations*, I, 383; immediately Wilson sandwiches into the *Recreations* two paragraphs on the subject of Ossian: one from 'Hints for the Holidays, III', September 1826, the other from 'Our Descriptive Poetry', May 1839. The paragraph in *Recreations*, I, 371-2, finally, is a combination of half a paragraph—ironically humorous, on railroads—from 'Our Two Panniers', *Blackwood*, June 1838, and half a paragraph—entirely serious, on Scottish character—from 'Hints for the Holidays, III', *Blackwood*, September 1826.

(5) *Changes of phrasing in 1842*

Naturally in carrying over the original articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* to the new context of 1842 Wilson makes dozens of changes in his phrasing. One is tempted to give a detailed list of these changes, since most of them are illuminating in one way or another, but this portion of the paper shall be limited severely.

¹ At the same time 'North' carries over one passage in the omitted closing pages of 'Cottages', xix, 265-6, to the second volume of the *Recreations*, 'Stroll to Grasmere', II, 336-8.

Interesting as an example of the new context, the phrase 'leagues above the snows of Chimborazo' (xx, 399) becomes 'the snows of the Himalayas', *Recreations*, I, 283, because Chimborazo had just been used above in the quotation from 'Christopher among the Mountains' (xliv, 297). Perhaps the most interesting single change shows the difference between 1830 and 1842. 'We shall smoke a cigar, and let sleep go to the dogs, the deuce, the devil, or the radicals', he wrote in December 1830 (xxviii, 894). 'Or the radicals' becomes 'and the Chartists' in *Recreations*, II, 326.

Generally speaking Wilson improves the word choice and softens the brutality of the originals, omits slurs at contemporaries, tones down rhetorical exaggeration, and certainly succeeds in condensing the originals by omitting long passages of poetry in the finished products of the *Recreations*.

He improves the phrasing, as when he reduces the tautological expression 'a young married woman his wife' (xix, 256) to 'a young woman, his wife' (*Recreations*, I, 168); or when he omits the absurd adjective 'lamplike' from 'a rushing gush [of tears]...bedimmed the lamplike lustre of his [Burns's] large black eyes' (xxix, 995; cf. *Recreations*, I, 207). He takes time to be exact:

We have been reading lately...a volume by a worthy German doctor whose name escapes us—on Singing Birds (xxxviii, 238).

...by a worthy German, Doctor Bechstein—on Cage Birds (*Recreations*, I, 212).

'Keeble' (xxvii, 837), misspelled throughout the article, correctly becomes 'Keble' in *Recreations*, II, 77.

Some changes in good taste are merely amusing: 'a maiden egg' (xxviii, 579) becomes 'an egg in no peril of parturition' (*Recreations*, I, 304), and 'hurdies of Surefoot' (xxviii, 597) becomes 'crupper of Surefoot' (*Recreations*, I, 334). But Wilson does frequently tone down the original brutality. For example, in his anger at the supposed poisoner of O'Bronte's sire, 'North' threatens in 1830 that his fist 'will smash his nose flat with the other features, till his face is one mass of blood' (xxviii, 596). The last clause is changed to 'till his face is a pancake' in *Recreations*, I, 333. Again, he softens his description of an old Highland soldier thus:

On what dreadful scenes of plunder, rape, and murder, when forts and towns were taken by storm, must those eyes, now withered into nothing, have glared with all the fury of a victorious soldier, raging in the lust of blood! (xix, 257).

On what dreadful scenes, when forts and towns were taken by storm, must those eyes, now withered into nothing, have glared with all the fury of man's most wrathful soul! (*Recreations*, I, 169).

A final example perhaps illustrates improvement in literary taste rather than a toning down of brutality. In describing a dead girl he substitutes an innocuous sentence,

We learned then how immeasurably misery can surpass happiness—that the soul is ignorant of its own being, till all at once a thunder-stone plunges down its depths, and groans gurgle upward upbraiding heaven, (*Recreations*, II, 117–18)

for the original ghastly passage describing how the lover learned

that she was in a coffin, six feet in earth—that the worms were working their way towards the body, to crawl into her bosom—that she was fast becoming one mass of corruption—when I awoke from the dead-fit of horrid dreams in which I had lain on the floor of my Agnes's own cottage, and cursed the sight of the heaven and the earth, and shuddered at the thought of the dread and dismal God—when I—.

(xix, 110)

Similarly, 'North' lessens his critical savagery, as a single illustration will show. Gray speaks of the owl, he says, 'like an old wife, or rather like an uninspired idiot', in *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxx, 273; 'like an old wife', in *Recreations*, II, 158. He omits satirical jibes at contemporaries: for example, the italicized words in 'There has been a new series of weather, to be sure, almost as dry as the *New Monthly*' (xx, 11) are omitted when the passage appears in the *Recreations* (II, 331); just as the italicized words in the original passage, 'As we turn our back upon ourselves, after the fashion of some of his majesty's ministers, for example *Sir Robert Peel*...' (xxviii, 888), disappear altogether in the *Recreations* (II, 248). Again,

Every one era has been prouder than another of its achievements, from that of Babel to that of Bentham.

(xlii, 594)

becomes

Every one Era and Ego has been prouder than another of its respective achievements.

(*Recreations*, II, 277)

Particularly noticeable is Wilson's omission of slurs at the 'Cockneys' in 1842 'Cockney' (xx, 671) becomes 'poetaster' (*Recreations*, II, 161); 'Some Passages in the Life of a Green Goose' 'published by Hunt and Clarke, Cockaigne' (xx, 660) becomes 'published by Quack and Co., Ludgate Lane' (*Recreations*, II, 129). Or compare these two passages:

Yet there were particular people he [the dog Fro] could not abide, nor from their hands would he have accepted a roasted potatoe out of the dripping-pan, and in this he resembles us in our contempt of Cockneys.

(xxiv, 298)

Yet there were particular people he could not abide, nor from their hands would he have accepted a roast potato out of the dripping-pan, and in this he resembled his master.

(*Recreations*, I, 48)

Though Wilson retains in the *Recreations* many lush passages which indeed illustrate his particular type of genius, he does prune rhetorical exaggeration generally, as the following examples show:

xxi, 504: ...her eyes...raised, ever and anon, in the dewy light of a beautiful enthusiasm, to the skies.

II, 7: ...raised, ever and anon, to the roof.

xxi, 512: ...and as aid we could give none, unless God had granted to our prayers an angel's wings.

The italicized words are omitted in the *Recreations*, II, 22.

xxviii, 881: The Lodge is seen to be standing in its stillness, far, far away, like some scene in a half-forgotten dream, of which the dim glimpses are felt to be delightful, and by strange sympathies through the imagination to affect the heart.

II, 313: The Lodge is seen to be standing in its stillness, far away!

XXIX, 325. [On Windermere in winter the frost-work imagery hangs more steadfastly] than ever hung the summer banks when all the heavens were still as the breath of a sleeping child!

I, 406: than ever hung the banks of summer¹

Sometimes, conversely, he improves an originally uninspired passage. The original 'A Day at Windermere' ends tamely: 'Our Study is in such darkness, that we cannot see our paper—and therefore in the midst of a thunder-storm we conclude our Article' (xxviii, 529) In the *Recreations* we read instead: 'Our study is in such darkness that we cannot see our paper—in the midst of a thunderstorm we conclude, and to bed by a flaff of lightning' (I, 261).

Finally, the character of 'Christopher North' remains about the same in 1842. He is, perhaps, more gallant:

Many females, too, look on nature with a milliner's or a mantua-maker's eye....

(xxviii, 868)

Some people look on nature with a milliner's or a mantua-maker's eye..

(*Recreations*, II, 235)

He is no less crusty:¹

There is every excuse for people in general falling into all manner of misconceptions regarding the character of birds. (xxx, 273, 'Audubon and Wilson', August 1831)

We really have no patience with people who persist in all manner of misconceptions regarding the character of birds. (*Recreations*, I, 157, 'Christopher in his Aviary')

He is far more modest. The numerous puffs Wilson bestows upon himself, especially in his early contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine*, are startling. In the *Recreations*, however, this fault disappears entirely. Thus he omits a passage from 'Cottages' (xix, 257; cf. *Recreations*, I, 170): 'But here let us call in to our aid a poem written by one who knows the Highlands well—and will not grudge, we hope, to see his poetry among our prose; we mean Professor Wilson.' Three and a half pages of poetry, his own 'Address to a Wild Deer', follow in the original.

II. THE *Recreations* AS AN ANTHOLOGY

(1) *A few words on Wilson*

If Goethe's saying be true, that he who has done enough for his own time has done enough for all times, John Wilson still retains a more than shadowy importance. With the perspective that a century gives we can now estimate 'Christopher North's' obvious faults and obvious virtues. De Quincey best sums up his friend's chief defect when, in a letter to Lockhart of 10 March 1830, he compliments Wilson on 'the extraordinary activity of his mind, whenever he does not wilfully throw it asleep under the sentimental, which, to my thinking, is his evil genius'.² All too often, it is true, 'North' appears to have been content merely to turn on the spigot of his emotions in order to

¹ But his bellicosity is dying. In an 'Hour's Talk about Poetry' he does not carry over the following sentence: 'Many of these hints will doubtless appear impertinent and heterodox: but we would not advise any hostile critic in any periodical work to attempt to prove them so; for if he do, he may count upon the crutch [i.e. a beating]' (xxx, 482; cf. *Recreations*, I, 194).

² A. Lang, *Life and Letters of J. G. Lockhart* (1897), II, 46.

produce a leading article. Nothing is easier, in considering Wilson, indeed, than to allow his obvious relapses into the sentimental to make us forget that this first-honours man at Oxford had the clearest perception of what the public wanted; that from his desire to be immediately popular he was quite willing (scorning posterity) to use the most immediate appeal to his age; that after the loss of his fortune in 1815 he supported himself almost entirely through magazine articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* and through lectures that, however lacking in philosophical profundity, marked him for some thirty years as the most stimulating teacher in the University of Edinburgh of his day. Despite his sentimental rhapsodizing and, it must be added, his diffuseness, Wilson has, moreover, certain merits: gaiety at his best, and geniality, and gusto; amazing versatility that justifies a quantitative rather than a qualitative consideration of his achievement; brilliance as an occasional critic, greater brilliance as a large-brush describer of Scottish scenery and the landscapes of Windermere; greatest brilliance as a masculine humorist (best shown in the *Noctes Ambrosianae*); and a big bow-wow style that appealed particularly to contemporary youth: witness Branwell Brontë, Frank Carr ('Lancelot Cross'), N. P. Willis, George Gilfillan, Samuel Warren, Charles Lever, and even John Ruskin—and that has kept its appeal for various admirers from his own to the present day.¹

Tom Moore might have congratulated Wilson, as he did Walter Scott, on his outdoor bringing up in contrast to the Irishman's own 'boudoir education'. For the sounding cataract haunted like a passion the boy at the Manse of Mearns as it haunted, a dozen years earlier, a boy of deeper character at Hawkshead. Wilson, indeed, almost perfectly illustrates the first two Wordsworthian ages; the glad animal movements of boyhood, the sensuous joy in nature of youth—never the third age, for the still, sad music of humanity found in him always something of the hurdy-gurdy. (One wonders, at times, if 'Christopher North' ever quite managed to grow up, if in his life and writings he did not remain largely adolescent, with the carelessness, volcanic emotionalism, cruelty, humour, and appealing gusto of youth.) Certainly the importance of boyhood in Wilson's literary productions cannot be over-estimated: biographical references to this period appear everywhere in his best work, written after 1825. . . . From the delicate and glowingly descriptive, often lapsing into sentimentality, to the jovial and high-spirited, often lapsing into brutality, runs much of Wilson's writing in maturity, fostered to a large extent by the experiences of his early years. In the *Recreations* of 1842 the material best worth remembrance consists of the author's large-brush descriptions of this period of youth.

¹ 'As a stylist, he has never received due recognition . . .', writes Malcolm Elwin in *Victorian Wallflowers* (1934), pp. 74-5. 'Lamb and Hazlitt, [as periodical writers] have come into their own, and the time for Wilson's recognition is long overdue.'

(2) *Non-critical matter in the Recreations*

As an anthology the *Recreations* has real importance. Wilson's memory for his purple patches appears in his inclusion in 'The Moors' of a single picturesque paragraph taken from a monotonous article 'Ancient Scottish Poetry. No. I. Dunbar' of February 1835, and in his carrying over the best passage from a review of 'The Fall of Nineveh' of February 1830 into 'Christopher in his Aviary'. The following letter of 4 October 1842, written to 'Delta' Moir, another chief supporter of *Blackwood's Magazine*, is of interest in this connexion:

I have lost several days in looking over till I am sick, all *Blackwood*, for a description of Christopher's house in Moray Place. It is somewhere pictured as the House of Indolence, and with some elaboration, as I once heard Horatio Macculloch, the painter, talk of it with rapture. I wish you would cast over in your mind where the description may be, as I would fain put it into a chapter in vol. III of 'Recreations' now printing. Sometimes a reader remembers what a writer forgets. It is not in a 'Noctes'. I read it with my own eyes not long ago; but I am ashamed of myself to think how many hours (days) I have wasted in wearily trying to recover it. Perhaps it may recur to you without much effort of recollection.

Yours affectionately,

John Wilson.¹

The variety of his powers appears also in the selections which he incorporates. He excludes almost completely his political articles, dozens of which appeared in *Blackwood*, but he does admit long extracts from 'Sadler on the Balance of Food', July 1830, cleverly introduced into 'The Moors' in 'North's' sermon to the social outcasts, with transitional paragraphs of colloquial conversation added for the sake of making this Tory economy-tirade more palatable. Naturally of course Wilson includes in the *Recreations* his finest passages: the fairy funeral (I, 295); the vivid if impossible rescue of her child from an eagle's nest by Hannah Lamond (suggested by a popular contemporary picture of the period) (II, 141); and even the two versions of the Red-Tarn Club and the Quaker of Helvellyn (II, 151), a contribution that originally shocked his readers in *Maga* most abominably. Isolated passages of real beauty chequer the *Recreations* everywhere. One only shall be given:

In all our wanderings through the Highlands, towards night we have always found ourselves at home. What though no human dwelling was at hand? We cared not—for we could find a bedroom among the casual inclinations of rocks, and of all curtains the wild-brier forms itself into the most gracefully-festooned draperies, letting in green light alone from the intercepted stars. Many a cave we know of—cool by day, and warm by night—how they happen to be so, we cannot tell—where no man but ourselves ever slept, or ever will sleep; and sometimes, on startling a doe at evening in a thicket, we have lain down in her lair, and in our slumbers heard the rain pattering on the roofing brk-tree, but felt not one drop on our face, till at dawning we struck a shower of diamonds from the fragrant tresses.

(I, 289)

The short stories which he includes, 'Tale of Expiation' and 'The Field of Flowers', are unhappy: the first in its melodrama, the second in its obviousness and absurdly overcharged morality. The first—in which the orphan-heroine is

¹ Mrs Mary Gordon, *Christopher North* (1866), p. 407. (The passage in question appears in *Recreations*, II, 309.)

first raped, then chopped up with a billhook—shows power in the depiction of the Calvinistic violator, but of all things such a story needs restraint and subdued painting—and Wilson pours on garishly and lavishly all the horrors of the grim Scottish crime. Just as absurd in the *Recreations*, on the other hand, are the selections honeyed in the sentimental. The number of holy, and anaemic, children in the pages of John Wilson's contributions to *Blackwood's Magazine* is remarkable indeed. If anybody desires a literary orphan-asylum he may apply here. Little Nell is a thing of flesh and blood in comparison with Wilson's children, who weep, read the Bible, and die, on the slightest provocation. Let those who remember 'North's' catapultic critiques in *Maga* on David Lester Richardson, Edwin Atherstone, Nicholas Michell, or Leigh Hunt's *Byron* rejoice in the milder beauties of 'The Holy Child' (*Recreations*, I, 410), who takes just eleven pages to expire. The parents of such children are too often worthy of their offspring. In the *Recreations* as in the original articles in *Blackwood*, series of loosely connected stories make up much of the material. Thus 'Inch-Cruin' (*Recreations*, I, 231 ff.) opens with a passable if rhetorical description of Scottish scenery about Loch Lomond, then turns into an extravagant narration concerning the various inmates of the lunatic asylum on the Island of the Afflicted. Other 'lights and shadows of Scottish life' constantly appear throughout the *Recreations*. 'Christopher in his Sporting Jacket', taken over bodily from the original article in *Blackwood*, 1828, does not gain from the long passage on the death of Emilius Godfrey (an orphan) or from a similar description of the death of the 'Blind Beauty of the Moor' (also an orphan), but in both selections (I, 67 ff., 71 ff.) Wilson shows commendable restraint, and the rest of the composition, filled with cat-coursing, fox-hunting, dog fights and man fights, all in the most extraordinary fusion with nature descriptions, shows its author's highest virtues; his masculinity, thundering humour, and joy in life. 'The Moors' in the first volume of the *Recreations* contains the cream of Wilson's descriptions; the length and diffuseness of the composition, however, make it dreary reading here and there. Altogether Wilson is most successful in his shorter selections which deal with his own boyhood and youth in the highlands and lowlands. 'A Day at Windermere' (I, 242), 'Our Parish' (I, 422), and 'The Snowball Bicker of Pedmount' (II, 274) offer the best reading in the *Recreations*. All three selections, it will be noted, are carried over entire from the originals in *Blackwood's Magazine*. In all three Wilson's great sin of diffuseness is held at a minimum.

(3) *Critical matter in the Recreations*

The preceding section has demonstrated, pretty clearly the unevenness of John Wilson as a writer, and this next section will find him equally uneven as a critic. We might expect Jeffrey of the *Edinburgh Review*, Delphic oracle

of the Whigs or liberals, to hold a somewhat radical and 'romantic' view of literature, Wilson, the Tory or conservative, to hold a conventional and decorously 'classical' view of literature. Just the reverse is true. Jeffrey has sanity and restraint: we know, generally speaking, what he will say of any given writer. Wilson has freshness and floridity: we never know what he will say of any given writer; moreover, we have a shrewd suspicion that he himself does not know until he starts writing his critique. Jeffrey too is consistent in his views, whereas we may be pretty certain that sooner or later Wilson will contradict what he says on one occasion by something violently opposed to it on another. Jeffrey may be the safer guide, yet to a contemporary reader Wilson probably had the greater appeal from his very spontaneity and unpredictability.

The critical essays in the *Recreations*, 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry' in the first volume, and 'Dr Kitchener', 'A Few Words on Thomson', and 'Sacred Poetry' (except for the discussion of Wordsworth) in the second, are distinctly disappointing. Indeed, Wilson's critiques reprinted in Ferrier's edition of *Essays: Critical and Imaginative*, in four volumes, give a much fairer idea of their author's critical powers, including as they do the famous review of Tennyson's poems, May 1832, the review of the poetry of Ebenezer Elliott two years later, of Coleridge's poetical works, October 1834, of Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*, December 1842, together with articles on Wordsworth and Shakespeare (amalgamated from several articles) and a whole volume on 'Homer and his Translators' which concludes the series. In the *Recreations* one ecstatic paragraph of praise for Wordsworth's nature poetry in Wilson's best manner does appear in the 'Stroll to Grasmere', II, 343, and his refreshing if decidedly personal disapproval of Wordsworth's remarks on James Thomson may be found in 'A Few Words on Thomson', II, 267 ff. It is pleasant, certainly, to find 'North' referring to Leigh Hunt as 'most vivid of poets, and most cordial of critics' in this latter piece (II, 260); but the critical essays in the *Recreations* lack 'North's' virtues of emotional warmth of enthusiasm, masculine commonsense, and stinging humour; and, not happily chosen to begin with, are furthermore diluted by the additions from other contributions to *Maga*. 'North's' enthusiasm for Keble's 'Christian Year' in one section of 'Sacred Poetry', if well merited, and his disapproval, aesthetic and moral, of a passage in Robert Montgomery's 'Omnipresence of the Deity' in another, if well taken, have nothing of the glow of Wilson's best articles in *Blackwood's Magazine* on Byron, Shelley, Wordsworth, or even the poetasters of his age. The greater part of 'Sacred Poetry', in short, if unexceptionable, is namby-pamby—and only 'Dr Kitchener' affords a glimpse of Wilson's good-natured spoofing and slapdash humour, and alone of the critiques shows something of 'Christopher North's' salty personality.

(a) *An Hour's Talk about Poetry*. 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry', however,

serves admirably to show the general character of Wilson's criticism. Even 'emotional warmth of enthusiasm' appears in parts of this critical essay, but it is warmth of enthusiasm that—I think it will be admitted—does not much enhance the reputation of the author.

Fraulein Helene Richter, in her discussion of Wilson as critic, *Geschichte der Englischen Romantik* (1916), II, 339–45, points out that in 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry' 'North' admits only one truly great poem in English literature, *Paradise Lost*. It is true that the last paragraph runs:

To this conclusion must we come at last—that in the English language there is but one Great Poem. What! Not *Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*? —*Paradise Lost*.¹

But there is a great deal more in the essay than the final paragraph, and to emphasize the author's sudden and unexpected final enthusiasm for Milton's masterpiece is charitably to disregard other less admirable critical estimates in the essay. Not only does 'North' admit 'The Seasons' and 'The Task' to be great poems (*Recreations*, I, 220); he also claims that virtue for 'Thalaba' and 'Kehama'! (I, 190). Fraulein Richter also points out that Wilson calls Walter Scott the greatest genius of the age, incomparably greater than Byron (I, 192). The passage in praise of Scott is a fine one. But, after all, 'North' speaks of Scott merely as a novelist. And in order fully to appreciate the compliment to Sir Walter in comparison with Byron, a sentence from 'North's' remarks on 'Baillie's Dramas' (I, 198) should be quoted also: 'To paint bad passions is not to praise them; they alone can paint them well who hate, fear, or pity them; and therefore Baillie has done so—nay start not—better than Byron.' At least the aside, 'nay start not', is an addition of 1842.

In short, 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry' is remarkable not so much in the fact that Wilson decides that only *Paradise Lost* is a great poem, as in the fact that in arriving at this very sensible conclusion he praises incidentally so many poets, big and little, on the way. The eulogy of 'Shakspeare in Petticoats, noble Joanna', as William Maginn somewhat irreverently styled the lady,² is by no means single; the strong-stomached reader can peruse if he will 'North's' general remarks on 'another glory belonging to this age, and almost to this age alone of our poetry—the glory of Female Genius' (*Recreations*, I, 194–9). The enthusiasm for Allan Cunningham's 'Maid of Elvar', again, if explicable in the original review of 1832, has small excuse ten years later in 1842. Wilson's nationalism appears most strongly, perhaps, in his praise for James Hogg. He even reprints a passage, comparing the Ettrick Shepherd favourably with Robert Burns, from an early article of February 1819—an article which had

¹ The original passage from 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry', *Blackwood's Magazine*, September 1831, xxx, 490, runs: 'To this conclusion must we come at last—that in the English language there is but one Great Poem. What! said you not that *Lear*, and *Hamlet*, and *Othello*, and *Macbeth* are all great Poems? We did—but therein we erred—for all the four have undergone—in the hands of their creator—disfiguration. There is—we repeat it—but one Great Poem alone in our tongue—*Paradise Lost*....'

² *Blackwood's Magazine*, xii, 82.

aroused the wrath of Keats far more than had the evisceration of his own 'Endymion' by *Blackwood's Magazine* at the time: 'The Blackwood Reviewers have committed themselves to a scandalous heresy—they have been putting up Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd, against Burns: the senseless villains.'¹

In the face of this enthusiasm for piety, Scotland, and poets in general, one is likely to disregard the fact that even in 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry' appear shrewd touches from the pen of 'Christopher North'. Wordsworth 'North' considers 'the High Priest of Nature' (I, 184), though on the next page his uncomplimentary estimate of 'The Excursion' (a poem concerning which Wilson in his various writings shows even more than his usual inconsistency) runs:

... Though it has an opening, it has no beginning; you can discover the middle only by the numerals on the page; and the most serious apprehensions have been very generally entertained that it has no end... As in its present shape it comprehends but a Three Days' Walk, we have but to think of an Excursion of three weeks, three months, or three years, to have some idea of Eternity. (I, 185)

His remarks on Coleridge's conversation perhaps constitute the most remarkable passage in the essay. I quote the first and last sentences:

Let the dullest clod that ever vegetated, provided only he be alive and hear, be shut up in a room with Coleridge, or in a wood, and subjected for a few minutes to the ethereal influence of that wonderful man's monologue, and he will begin to believe himself a Poet... We only know this, that Coleridge is the alchymist that in his crucible melts down hours to moments—and lo! diamonds sprinkled on a plate of gold. (I, 185, 187)

The passage in 'An Hour's Talk about Poetry' that contradict the dicta in Wilson's various other critical writings can but be referred to in passing. Byron perhaps suffers most cruelly. Wilson claims that 'Childe Harold', canto third, owes its being to the 'Lyrical Ballads' and 'The Excursion' (*Recreations*, I, 193, from *Blackwood's Magazine*, September 1831, xxx, 481). In June 1817, however, he writes concerning the third canto of 'Childe Harold':

[Byron] leapt at once into the first rank of descriptive poets. He came into competition with Wordsworth upon his own ground, and with his own weapons; and in the first encounter, he vanquished and overthrew him. His description of the stormy night among the Alps—of the blending—the mingling—the fusion of his own soul, with the raging elements around him,—is alone worth all the dull metaphysics of the Excursion....

(*Blackwood's Magazine*, I, 289)

His statement that 'Don Juan exhibits almost every kind of talent; and in it the degradation of poetry is perfect' (*Recreations*, I, 194) should also be compared with his earlier critiques on Byron. A particularly glaring example of Wilson's inconsistency appears in his estimates of Spenser and of allegory in September 1831 and 1834.

That fire was a fortunate one in which so many books of it [*The Faery Queen*] were burnt. If no such fortunate fire ever took place, then let us trust that the moths drillingly devoured the manuscript—and that 'tis all safe. Purgatorial pains—unless indeed they prove eternal—are insufficient punishment for the impious man who invented Allegory, etc. (September 1831, *Blackwood*, xxx, 490)

¹ Sidney Colvin, *Letters of John Keats* (1891), p. 234.

We...take it for granted... that you confess that an allegorical poem may be the greatest and most glorious—because most difficult—achievement of human genius...

Spenser is beyond all compare the most wonderful allegorical poet... No allegorical poem, either previous or succeeding, has approached the Faerie Queen within half the diameter of the earth. . (Several pages follow, defending Spenser's allegory from the critics.) (September 1834, *Blackwood*, xxxvi, 414 ff.)

The first passage Wilson carries over into the *Recreations*, I, 230, disregarding the equally eloquent defense of allegorical poetry written just three years later.

(b) *Wordsworth*. Concerning no poet do Wilson's self-contradictions as a critic show themselves more startlingly than in his treatment of Wordsworth; and for this reason his estimate of Wordsworth's religious soundness and unsoundness is of interest. Of the pages in the *Recreations* that I have been able to identify with some original source in *Blackwood's Magazine*, the only one deserving special consideration occurs in 'Sacred Poetry', II, 59-65, and deals with the religion of the first book of 'The Excursion'. To understand this passage we may trace Wilson's treatment of the subject, Wordsworth's religious faith, up to 1842, though our outline will be anything but exhaustive.

In July 1819, Wilson had praised Wordsworth's poetry for its virtue of consolatory faith.

Certain it is, that of all the poets of this age, or perhaps any age, Wordsworth holds the most cheering and consolatory faith—and that we at all times rise from his poetry, not only with an abatement of those fears and perplexities which the dark aspect of the world often flings over our hearts, but almost with a scorn of the impotence of grief, and certainly with a confiding trust in the perfect goodness of the Deity. We would appeal, for the truth of these remarks, to all who have studied the Two Books of the Excursion, entitled, The Church Yard among the Mountains..

(‘Crabbe’s Tales of the Hall’, *Blackwood’s Magazine*, v, 471)

In June 1827, he had accused the poet of being ‘utterly insensible to, or rather utterly forgetful of, religion’.

Who of our living poets has ever, in one single instance, fully, unequivocally, and fervently, declared religion to be all in all? Not one. Wordsworth's religion is that of a wanderer in the woods, rather than a frequenter of the places of divine worship where Christians meet—and in his longest and most elaborate description of human suffering in all his works—that one in which he has put forth all his powers, and all his resources, and all his knowledge of mortal influences—the story of Margaret, the deserted widow, in the Excursion—there is not one syllable about religion, or its sustaining comforts—the sufferer goes not even to church—nor have we any reason to believe, that in her miserable dwelling there is a Bible. She does not seem to have known the doctrine of a future state. The picture, consequently, is rather painful than pathetic; and the reader wonders, at the close of the tale, how such a man as Wordsworth could have had his mind, for so long a time, utterly insensible to, or rather forgetful of, religion.

(‘Aird’s Religious Characteristics’, XXI, 677)

At the end of 1828, again, he had startled Henry Crabb Robinson¹ and very probably the world in general by a renewed attack upon ‘The Excursion’.

¹ See *Correspondence of H. O. Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle*, ed. by Edith J. Morley (1927), I, 197-8 and 200-1. Robinson ascribes the onslaught to ‘mere Scotch-presbyterian malignity’. Wordsworth is convinced that Wilson wrote the article.

Interestingly Robinson himself privately felt that ‘Wordsworth’s own religion, by the by, would not satisfy either a religionist or a sceptic’, but instead of trumpeting the idea to the world as Wilson did in *Maga*, the diarist entered the dreadful thought in cipher in his pages: *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and their Writers*, ed. by Edith J. Morley (1938), II, 481.

contrasting its unorthodoxy with the satisfactory 'Christian Psalmist' of James Montgomery. This review will be discussed in a moment. In 1834 in passing, as well as in 1835 at great length, he had praised Wordsworth for his religious faith.

How gloriously Wordsworth has achieved his gracious object [to give the charm of novelty to things of every day], all the world knows; in poetry that, beyond that of any other man, has purified, and elevated all those feelings that constitute our faith in the goodness of God, as displayed in the external world, and in the internal senses by which we hold communion with nature. ('Coleridge's Poetical Works', xxxvi, 566)

We know that Wordsworth is the only Great Poet who has ever devoted his whole life to Poetry, and poured into it his whole spirit, not for the sake alone of his own delight in the creations of his own genius, but for the glory of his fellow-creatures—we say it with all reverence—for the glory of his creator.

('Wordsworth's New Volume', xxxvii, 704)

This passage is not reprinted in the *Recreations*, but the eulogy of the 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets', etc., which follows, has been carried over: cf. 2, last line p. 65 to p. 70.

Now the second part of 'Sacred Poetry' in the second volume of the *Recreations* deals with Wordsworth's religious orthodoxy and unorthodoxy, and, written in 1842, may be considered Wilson's final word on the subject. Wilson quotes five pages from the article of December 1828, developing the thesis that

Among the great living poets, Wordsworth is the one whose poetry is to us the most inexplicable—with all our reverence for his transcendent genius, we do not fear to say the most open to the most serious charges—on the score of its religion. . . .

In none of Wordsworth's poetry, previous to his 'Excursion', is there any allusion made, except of the most trivial and transient kind, to Revealed Religion. He certainly cannot be called a Christian poet. . . . The religion of this great Poet—in all his poetry published previous to 'The Excursion'—is but the 'Religion of the Woods'. (II, 54-5)

He then laments the absence of Christianity in 'The Excursion' (particularly in the first book), concluding that

This utter absence of Revealed Religion, where it ought to have been all-in-all—for in such trials in real life it is all-in-all, or we regard the existence of sin or sorrow with repugnance—shocks far deeper feelings within us than those of taste, and throws over the whole poem to which the tale of Margaret belongs, an unhappy suspicion of hollowness and insincerity in that poetical religion, which at the best is a sorry substitute indeed for the light that is from heaven. . . . And when we find the Christian religion thus excluded from Poetry, otherwise as good as ever was produced by human genius, what are we to think of the Poet, and of the world of thought and feeling, fancy and imagination, in which he breathes, nor fears to declare to all men that he believes himself to be one of the order of the High Priests of nature? (II, 58-9)

In the original article of 1828 Wilson goes on to praise the 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets', which even, however, 'are not, although all pertaining to divine things, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Christian faith'—and then to develop the notion that there are two Wordsworths: the early irreligious and the later religious; and yet (thereby taking back everything he has thus far said) that the early is preferable to the later. The really central passage of December 1828 has not been carried over to the *Recreations*:

Neither, we think, can the devoted admirers and lovers of the Lyrical Ballads help wondering, either at the total absence of all feelings and thoughts in any way connected with Religious Establishments *in them*, or at the prevalence of such feelings in the Ecclesiastical Sonnets. On turning from the one to the other, we do not see one Wordsworth in two different and opposite lights—but we, for our own parts, cannot help seeing two Wordsworths. Now, however defective of old, and in itself insufficient to satisfy all the demands of the soul, was the religion of the woods of Wordsworth Primus, even now we cannot but prefer it to the religion of the cathedral of Wordsworth Secundus. The altar before which the one did most devoutly bow or kneel, was of the grassy turf—and never had the great goddess Nature a sincerer, a nobler worshipper. The altar which the other—but we feel that we have no right to pursue the parallel, although we have a right to suggest it—for the poetry of Wordsworth is a possession belonging to all men—and they are not worthy to study it, who are not also privileged to speak of it before the world with that freedom of thought which all its strains inspire, and which can never be exerted by us towards him or his inspirations, without due and becoming reverence. ('Sacred Poetry', *Blackwood's Magazine*, xxiv, 928)

(Just how this 'due and becoming reverence' has appeared in the previous remarks on 'The Excursion' may be a little difficult for the average intelligence to follow.)

Instead of quoting this last passage in the *Recreations*, Wilson adds five new pages—not to be found anywhere in *Blackwood's Magazine*—in which he laments anew the absence in 'The Excursion' of the paramount virtue of true religion. A paragraph illustrates his contention:

We said, that for the present we should confine our remarks on this subject to the story of Margaret; but they are, more or less, applicable to almost all the stories in 'The Excursion'. In many of the eloquent disquisitions and harangues of the Three Friends, they carry along with them the sympathies of all mankind; and the wisest may be enlightened by their wisdom. But what we complain of is, that neither in joy nor grief, happiness nor misery, is religion the dominant principle of thought and feeling in the character of any one human being with whom we are made acquainted, living or dead. Of not a single one, man or woman, are we made to feel the beauty of holiness—the power and the glory of the Christian Faith. Beings are brought before us whom we pity, respect, admire, love. The great poet is high-souled and tender-hearted—his song is pure as the morning, bright as day, solemn as night. But his inspiration is not drawn from the Book of God, but from the Book of Nature. Therefore it fails to sustain his genius when venturing into the depths of tribulation and anguish. Therefore imperfect are his most truthful delineations of sins and sorrows; and not in his philosophy, lofty though it be, can be found alleviation or cure of the maladies that kill the soul. Therefore never will 'The Excursion' become a bosom-book, endeared to all ranks and conditions of a Christian People, like 'The Task' or the 'Night Thoughts'. Their religion is that of revelation—it acknowledges no other source but the word of God. . . . (II, 62–3)

This quotation is entirely in keeping, it will be noted, with the five pages from 'Sacred Poetry' of *Blackwood's Magazine*, December 1828, that immediately precede the five unidentified pages under discussion.

After these ten pages on the poet's unorthodoxy, Wilson quotes a long philosophic paragraph from 'Christopher in his Alcove' of April 1839, *Blackwood's Magazine*, xlv, 562, dealing with 'the light of nature in comparison with the light of revelation', which originally had nothing to do with Wordsworth but which he now tacks on to 'The Excursion'—and then by a natural transition—

Had 'The Excursion' been written in the poet's later life, it had not been so liable to such objections as these; for much of his poetry composed since that era is imbued with a religious spirit, answering the soul's desire of the devoutest Christian. (II, 66)

he gives four and a half pages from 'Wordsworth's New Volume' of May 1835, xxxvii, 708-11, defending in superlative eulogy the true piety and orthodoxy of Wordsworth's later work, illustrated by the 'Ecclesiastical Sonnets' and minor poems. Thus does the defender of the faith, in his final estimate in the *Recreations* of 1842, combine ten pages of expostulation at Wordsworth's unorthodoxy in 'The Excursion' with five pages of praise for the poet's later piety. The piece ends with a few more pages on James Montgomery (taken from Wilson's review of 'Montgomery's Pelican Island' of October 1827) in which pages Wordsworth is incidentally introduced: 'The piety of his [Montgomery's] poetry is far more Christian than that of Wordsworth' (II, 72).

Possibly the discussion of Wordsworth's Christianity is hardly worth such extended notice. The passages show not Wilson's inconsistency so much as an unctuousness, particularly irritating if one reads his own 'Holy Child' in the *Recreations*. But these pages in the *Recreations* contain Wilson's final estimate of Wordsworth in 1842, and must be added to his other stimulating if tie-beamless critical stridulations. Wilson's genius, as Andrew Lang well says, 'was perhaps the most unbalanced in the history of literature'.¹ He substituted for a technic a pyrotechnic, and, impelled by his moods, spiked the canons of criticism for the applause, at least, of contemporaries.

ALAN LANG STROUT

LUBBOCK, TEXAS

¹ *The Life and Letters of J. G. Lockhart* (1897), I, 125.

OLD PROVENÇAL MISCELLANY¹

1. TROUBADOURS AS PRECURSORS OF DANTE

In his poem *Us noels pessamens* (Gr. 355, 20), P. Raimon complains of the injustice of his mistress who bade him come to her and then broke her promise. He continues (ll. 23–27):

- 24 Que qui non a vezat aver
 gran be, plus leu pot sostener
 afan; que tals es rics e bos
26 que·l maltrag l' es plus angoyssos,
 quan h soven benanansa.

Cavaliere translates this passage, following Anglade in its interpretation. 'Chi infatti non è abituato ad avere gran bene può più facilmente sopportare gli affanni; che tale [uomo] è nobile e prode, a cui la sventura riesce più angosciata, quando si ricorda della felicità.' The sense of this translation is not very clear, but neither Jeanroy (*Rom.* 63, 111–14) nor Spanke (*Litbl.* 59, 187) made any objection to that interpretation of the text, and what has been proposed by Kolsen (*Arch.* 168, 260) is unsatisfactory.² Indeed, how can a man be called brave and noble, because misfortune appears more grievous to him through remembering former happiness? I think that the key to a right understanding of the passage is afforded by *tals* (l. 25). This word, accompanied by a principal clause, often has the sense, roughly speaking, of a determinative pronoun followed by a relative one and may be translated by 'many a person who' or 'the one who' (cp. Levy, *S.W.B.* VIII, 11). So the semicolon after *afan* is to be cancelled and to be replaced by one at the end of the line.³ I translate: 'For he who is not accustomed to have much luck, is more capable of suffering misery than one who is noble and high in rank; for misfortune grieves the latter more if he remembers (former) good fortune.'

It is only by interpreting the passage in this way that the sense of the last two lines comes out clearly; they anticipate the famous lines of Dante's *Inferno* (v, 121 ff.):

Nessun maggior dolore
Che ricordarsi del tempo felice
Nella miseria.

P. Raimon is not the only troubadour to express this idea. In the first stanza of his poem *Mout a poignat amors* (Gr. 167, 39), Gaucelm Faidit complains of

¹ Most of the following observations have been suggested to me by two recent editions of troubadours: (1) *Le poesie di Peire Raimon de Tolosa*, ed. by Alfredo Cavaliere (Bibl. dell' Arch. rom. i, 22), Florence 1935; (2) *Poésies du troubadour Aimeric de Belenoi*, ed. by Maria Dumitrescu, Paris (Société des Anciens Textes), 1935.

² At any rate, Kolsen ought not to have objected to the expression *a vezat aver*, which he changes into *es vezatz d' aver*, because it is seen in one of the poems of Gaucelm Faidit edited by Kolsen himself. The passage in question is discussed below.

³ Kolsen, too, proposes to put a semicolon there.

the cruelty of his lady, who has made him suffer for nearly ten years, 'whereas, before that time, he had had many a pleasure. The last lines of that stanza run thus:

Car plus es greus malanans 'a sofrir
a sel que a mains bens vezat jauzir.¹

It is a striking fact that both these passages, expressing the same idea, employ the same expression *aver vezat faire alc. re*, which, as far as I know, has not yet been noticed in any other Provençal text. It stands to reason that this coincidence is not mere chance, one of the poets being likely to have borrowed text and idea from the other. Which of them, however, has been the other's model is difficult to say, because it is impossible to date either of the poems.

What is certain, however, is that neither the two troubadours nor Dante were the first to conceive that melancholy thought. It already occurs in Boethius: 'In omni adversitate fortunae, infelicissimum est genus infortunii fuisse felicem' (*Cons. phil.* II, 4) and in Thomas Aquinas: 'Memoria praeteritorum bonorum... in quantum sunt amissa, causat tristitiam' (*Sum. theol.* II, ii, 36, 1). The two troubadours employed that idea, which they may have learnt at school, in their usual reflective manner, depicting one of those fictitious situations of distressed lovers in which the Provençal lyric is so rich. Dante puts the words in the mouth of Francesca, and so they get something of the truth and poetical reality of that most passionate scene in which they are spoken. He makes Francesca add the words: *e ciò sa il tuo dottore*; but it is not only the 'doctor' (Vergil?) who knows that; it is Dante, too, who, exiled from his town and home, was forced to eat the 'salty bread of other people'. So we may give those words of Francesca, though uttered by an unfortunate lover, a vaster meaning based on the poet's bitter personal experience and written with his heart's blood. *Sapienti sat!*

2. A PASSAGE IN THE ALBIGENSIAN CHRONICLE

In the edition of that epic poem published by Paul Meyer, we read the following lines (5192-94):

Entre massas e peiras e espazas, qui que·ls tir,
e destrals e guazarmas per lo chaple endorzir,
lor feiro la carreira e la plassa sortir.

The editor translates this passage thus: 'Par l'effort des massues, des pierres, des épées, des cognées, des guisarmes, qui rendaient le carnage terrible, ils (les Toulousains) leur firent vider la rue et la place.' We have two objections to make to that interpretation. The first of them concerns the expression *Entre... e...*, whose nature seems not to have been recognized by the French scholar. It cannot mean 'par l'effort de', but it is that well-known *entre... e...*

¹ Ed. Kolsen, *Trobadorgedichte* No. 11.

which joins different subjects together.¹ So the subject of *fewro* (l. 5194) is not the Toulousans, but 'all those substantives enumerated in the first two lines. Thus the description of the battle proves to be of a stylistic fineness which is not revealed in Meyer's translation. The battle is seen as an entanglement of weapons and projectiles in violent movement, and it is the latter and not men that seem to fight. The fighters themselves remain, as it were, anonymous. This anonymity is further emphasized by the sentence *qui que·ls tir*, in which we find the second of the above-mentioned misinterpretations.

These words have found no place in Meyer's translation. The glossary gives the following explanation. 'malgré tout, quoi qu'on fasse.' But how should *qui que·ls tir* mean this? Probably, Meyer thought of *tirar* in the sense of 'to annoy'. But then, that verb would be an intransitive one, and *·ls* could only be considered as an accusative with the function of the dative, which may be the case in Old Provençal.² The four words would then have to be translated: 'whosoever may annoy them', but there would be no sense in such a translation. On the other hand, *tirar* is often found in one of those ready-made formulae in which the style of the Provençal poets abounds, for the purpose of filling up their lines or finding easy rhymes. That formula generally shows a form like this: (a) *cun que (so) tir* 'whomsoever this may annoy', and it is probably something like this which Meyer had in mind. But the text runs differently, and we have to follow it. So I think that *qui que·ls tir* cannot be interpreted otherwise than by 'whosoever may discharge (fling, draw) them', the last word referring to all those weapons and projectiles named in the first two lines.

Two objections can be made to this interpretation. The first question is whether the verb *tirar* could be used in connexion with all those warlike objects. I am inclined to think that this was possible for a poet who wished to express himself in the shortest possible way and who was therefore forced to find one single word for such a variety of actions, which, moreover, may be considered as serving the same purpose. Besides, we may refer to Levy, *S.W.B.* VIII, 236 'abschiessen' and Godefroy, x, 770 a.

The second difficulty seems to me more important. All the substantives enumerated in the first two lines are of the feminine gender, and the text ought to offer *las* instead of *·ls* (= *los*). This objection would be irrelevant for the first part of the chronicle, where *·ls* often occurs as the enclitic form of *las*.³ But can the author of the second part be charged with the same mistake? There is perhaps another explanation possible. The substantive *destrals* was not

¹ Th. Heinermann, "'Inter...et'" und seine Fortsetzungen in den romanischen Sprachen,' *ZfrPh.* I, 305-18.

² Cp. Appel, *Chrestomathie* p. xiv; Levy, *Arch.* 143, 98; Schultz-Gora, *Prov. Stud.* p. 9, n. 23. Also in the *Cros Alb.*, e.g. 'E vuelh que·ls o digatz' (l. 2969); 'mais no·ls cal temer Frances' (l. 4014).

³ Cp. Meyer's edition, vol. II, p. cii.

only feminine, as Levy indicates in his *Petit Dictionnaire*, but occurred also as masculine, in Old French at least, as is to be seen from Töbler-Lommatzsch II, 1784, 25. The passages of the Albigensian chronicle which show this word are not decisive for either of the genders. But if we are permitted to attribute a masculine *destrals* to the author of the second part of the chronicle, all is in good order. This one masculine word would have allowed the poet to employ *·ls* = *los* in spite of the rest of the words being feminine. Cp. 'C'onors e pretz, larguess' e cortezia Son toz perduz, e sors la mala fes' Gr. 461, 249 (Kolsen, *Beitr. z. altprov. Lyrik*, Bibl. dell' Arch. rom. I, 27, p. 228 and note p. 229). There is, finally, another possibility of explaining this *·ls* without fundamentally changing the interpretation of the passage. In this *los* we might see the fighters themselves and translate accordingly: 'whosoever may shoot on them.' For this signification of *trar* cp. Godefroy, x, 770b. At any rate, whichever of the two explanations of *los* we may choose, the stylistic merit of the passage as giving an impressive description of a fight in which the weapons seem to be the real fighters, remains unchanged.

3. AIMERIC DE BELENOI AND ITALY—AUTHENTICITY OF SOME OF HIS POEMS

The careful edition which Miss Dumitrescu published of Aimeric's poems in 1935 was presented to the *Société des Anciens Textes* as early as 1932. This is probably the reason why she has not taken into consideration a very important article of De Bartholomaeis concerning her poet, which appeared in *Studi medievali* n.s. IV (1931), 355-41: 'Poesie indebitamente attribuite a Rambaldo di Vaqueras II.' Even before him, Stroński, in his edition of Folquet de Marseilla, p. 132*, had suggested a thesis which the Italian scholar, evidently without knowing Stroński's observation, treated again and justified in detail, i.e. that Aimeric not only mourned Nuño Sánchez of Roussillon in a complaint (Gr. 9, 1 = Dum. XII), but also, as is shown by the *tornadas*, dedicated to him his poems Gr. 9, 7 (= Dum. III) and Gr. 9, 14 (= Dum. VI). The editor of Aimeric's poems has not, it is true, overlooked Stroński's suggestion, but she refuses to adopt it. She declares (p. 12 note 4) the envoy of the second of the two above-mentioned poems to be apocryphal, because it is preserved only in three manuscripts (CRS), and relegates it to the *varia lectio*. In No. III, on the other hand, she prefers the reading of AB, which offer *n' Aimo*, to that of PS, which have *nimo* = *Nuno*. In *n' Aimo* she sees Aimon, count of Savoy and brother to Beatrice, countess of Provence. I think that Miss Dumitrescu would not have clung to her opinion if she had met with De Bartholomaeis' arguments in time. Those arguments, which seem to me quite convincing, can be backed by these two of which De Bartholomaeis did not make use: (1) Aimon is, as far as I know, named by none of the numerous troubadours who

went to Italy;¹ (2) the Italian writer of MS. A(B), to whom the name of Nuño must have been quite uncommon, may easily have been tempted to replace it by that of Aimon, which was very frequent in the house of Savoy (cp. De Bartholomaeis, p. 337).

So we are allowed to eliminate Aimon as a protector of our poet. If this is true, we may further call in question whether Aimeric had any relations at all with Italy. There seems to be one very strong argument against denying them. In his poem Gr. 9, 21 (=Dum. xv), Aimeric names a great number of Italian ladies.² Now, Miss Dumitrescu is of opinion that Aimeric, in order to make such a poem, must have been in relations with the Italian families to which those ladies belonged. But this argumentation, seemingly so clear and conclusive, is fallacious. For, with his poem, Aimeric only imitates one of Albert de Sestaro (Gr. 16, 13): taking over into his own poem the rhyming words of his model, he changes Albert's apparently misogynic attitude into its very contrary. That is nothing but an ingenious play which could have been enjoyed also by people living far from Italy, provided that Albert's poem was known to them. That this was the case in the south of France is proved by the fact that the poem is found also in MS. C. So the poet, who amused his hearers with a parody of Albert's poem, need not necessarily have known the ladies whom he glorifies and whose names he found in his model. On the contrary, two little details which can be observed in Aimeric's poem lead us to assume that our poet has never seen Italy: (1) It is very significant that Albert, who was quite familiar with Italian life (see his poems Gr. 16, 1, 2; 6; 11; 13), names Conrad I of Monferrat 'en Colrat *mon* senhor', whereas, in the corresponding verse, Aimeric calls him 'en Colrat *lo* senhor'. (2) In the second tornada, Albert praises the same Conrad; in Aimeric's imitation, the second envoy is missing.

So we think that De Bartholomaeis (*Poesie provenzali storiche etc.*, cp. Dum. p. 14, note 2) was absolutely right in reckoning Aimeric among the troubadours who have never been in Italy, and Miss Dumitrescu herself is compelled to state (p. 16) that, except for this poem, there are no proofs whatever of Aimeric's having personally known those Italian families.³

On this occasion, a word may be said about the attribution of some of the

¹ Jeanroy, *Poés. lyr. des Trouv.* I, 238 mentions him only in connexion with Aimeric.

² It is this poem which Stroński (*Folquet de Marseille*, p. 132*) has in mind when speaking of Aimeric's *treva*. Though this word appears in the poem, forming even the rhyme of l. 19, Stroński ought not to have given it that name. The latter is borrowed from a poem of Guilhem de la Tor (Gr. 236, 5a), which has that name and also praises Italian ladies. As Stroński is, moreover, mistaken in the number of the poem—he writes Gr. 9, 4 instead of 9, 21—Miss Dumitrescu has not been able to identify it (p. 14, note 1).

³ Following Miss Dumitrescu Ruggieri (*Arch. rom.* xxi, 158) claims that Aimeric passed part of his life at the court of Thomas I of Savoy. From there, he says, the poet's fame spread over Italy and found an echo in Dante's *Vulg. El.* and in the *Landreide*. But there is, as we saw, not the slightest proof of such a story of Aimeric in Savoy, and it is quite unnecessary to suppose it for the purpose of showing the course which Aimeric's fame as a poet took. For Dante also praises Bernard de Ventadorn, Bertran de Born, and Giraut de Bornelh, none of whom had ever had any relations with Italy.

poems that are given in the manuscripts under Aimeric's name. There is first Gr. 392, 26 (=Dum. xix). The great majority of the manuscripts attribute it to Raimbaut de Vaqueiras, only CPS to Aimeric. Already in 1893, Schultz-Gora (*Die Briefe des Trobadors R. de V. etc.* p. 17) denied it to Raïmbaut, and generally provençalists have followed his opinion. Later on, Stroński and De Bartholomaeis connected it with Nuño Sánchez, the envoy showing that mysterious *senher n' Imo*, this time even without the variant *n' Aimo*. Here, again, it is advisable to read the *nmo* of the manuscript as *nuno* = Nuño. Miss Dumitrescu does not do so, prepossessed by the idea that there must have been relations between Aimeric and the court of Savoy. Thus she deprives herself of one of the most solid arguments in favour of Aimeric's authorship. That which she gives instead is not very conclusive. Following a suggestion of Stroński (*Folquet de Marseille*, pp. 125* and 130*), she claims that the writers of Provençal manuscripts, hesitating between a well-known and a less-known author, often attribute a poem to the former. This argument was good in Stroński's case; for there, the copyists had to choose between Folquet de Marseilla and Folquet (Falquet) de Romans, authors bearing the same name. It cannot be good in our case, where a confusion of Aimeric and Raimbaut was not possible. As, therefore, such an identity of names cannot have been the reason why the manuscript writers were induced to an erroneous attribution of our poem, there must have been another source for that mistake. It can, in my opinion, only be found in the fact that the second tornada names a certain Beatrix. Now it was and it is widely known that Raimbaut had intimate relations with a lady of that name. The lady of our poem is, it is true, not that of Raimbaut, but provençalists know on what futile grounds authorships have been established by medieval scribes.

Another poem whose authenticity needs discussion is the *Descors*, Gr. 9, 20 (=Dum. xi). The editor seems to be quite sure of Aimeric's authorship, though she herself utters two doubts regarding it. The first of them is that this poem would be the only one among Aimeric's that makes allusions to epic heroes (p. 21); the second that it is dedicated to a certain *na India*, whose name is connected with Aimeric de Pegulhan rather than with Aimeric de Belenoi (cp. p. 21, note 2 and Bergert, *Die von den Trob. gen. u. gef. Damen*, pp. 32-3). To these doubts we may add that MS. C, the only one that has preserved our poem, is not very trustworthy in its attributions, a fact which the editor herself emphasizes on p. 40. Finally, the poem shows all sorts of grammatical and stylistic incorrectnesses (cp. ll. 7, 37, 54, 64), which Aimeric carefully avoids in his other poems.¹ All these arguments taken together, I am of opinion that the *Descors* is not to be attributed to Aimeric de Belenoi.

¹ It is characteristic of the purity of Aimeric's grammatical attitude that, in his poem Gr. 9, 21 (=Dum. xv), the above-mentioned imitation of Albert's Gr. 16, 13, he does not imitate the grammatical mistakes which he found in his model, though he builds up his poem with the same rhyming words.

In other cases, I am inclined to defend the authenticity of a poem against the decision of the editor. She thinks (pp. 25-6) the attribution of Gr. 9, 16 (=Dum. xx) to be erroneous because (1) the two manuscripts which offer it (CR) place it at the end of Aimeric's poems, (2) the form of the stanza employed by the poet is uncommon in Aimeric. To the first argument we may reply that, in a series of poems, one must necessarily be the last. Moreover, Miss Dumitrescu herself contests the validity of that argument for Gr. 9, 13 (=Dum. v) and Gr. 9, 1 (=Dum. xii); cp. pp. 20 and 21, note 2. The second of the editor's doubts concerns the form. This form is extremely simple: *abba cca*, and its simplicity fully agrees with the metrical habits of Aimeric, who prefers such plain forms. But, says the editor, the stanza is indivisible, whereas all the other poems of undoubted attribution show bipartite stanzas. I doubt this latter statement to be true for Dum. viii (Gr. 9, 17) and Dum. xix (Gr. 392, 26¹). But even supposing it to be true, are we authorized to banish a poem from an author's poetical work on the ground of such an insignificant fact? The editor further argues that, in his other poems, Aimeric never repeats in the second part of a stanza the rhymes he has employed in the first. Well, that may be true for bipartite stanzas, where there are really two parts. But if the stanza offers a whole and indivisible structure and thus contains no first and second parts, as is the case here, how could the poet observe that would-be rule? So, unless more serious arguments are found against Aimeric's authorship, and though the attributions of MS. C may not be beyond all doubts, this poem ought to be reckoned among the genuine songs of our poet.

These considerations concerning the form lead us to a more general remark. We possess about twenty poems of Aimeric, rather a small number. Does this small number of poems give us a right to establish for the poet a certain metrical system and to assert that such and such of his poems cannot be his because of their form? Cannot the poet have sometimes made an exception to his metrical habits or to what we think to have been such? These doubts may be applied to another of Aimeric's poems, Gr. 9, 5 (=Dum. xvi), which the editor denies to him for metrical reasons. It is attributed to our poet by MSS. EJKN, to G. Aymar by C. The poem offers rather a complicated form, not unsimilar to that of Arnaut Daniel's sextine and, especially in the first stanza, some rare words such as *branda*, *braus*, *branc*, *brecs*, etc. These are indeed phenomena uncommon in Aimeric's other poems, as far as we know them. But why should not the poet have made an experiment in *trobar clus*,² too? The editor, however, alleges that Guillem Ademar, to whom the poem is attributed by MS. C and who is, in her opinion, to be reckoned among the 'obscure' troubadours, is the real author of our poem. But that argumentation is rather

¹ The editor, it is true, places this poem among those of doubtful attribution; but, in reality, she thinks it to be authentic (see above).

² In spite of its artificial form and the rarity of some of its words, the poem offers no special difficulties to our comprehension.

dangerous. We may convert it and say that the scribe of C, which contains nearly all the poems of Guillem Ademar, has been induced to attribute the poem to that author just because it reminded him of Guillem's manner. Here again, I should refrain from contesting the authenticity of the poem for mere formal reasons and against the testimony of four to one manuscripts. Appel evidently was of the same opinion; for, in the last edition of his *Chrestomathie*, he still offers the poem under Aimeric's name.

4. THE PSEUDONYM OC-E-NO

It is well known that Bertran de Born has given special names to the three sons of Henry I of England. That invented for Richard Cœur-de-Lion was *Oc-e-No*. The origin and meaning of this name has not yet been found. Appel, in his monograph on this poet (*Bertran von Born*, Halle, 1931), p. 68, note 1, takes into consideration the possibility that, by giving Richard that name, the poet might have intended to reproach him with fickleness. But Appel is not inclined definitely to adopt that explanation. Indeed, it would have been strange if the poet had given his liege lord such a disrespectful name. Moreover, passages like this (Gr. 80, 2 = Appel 26; VII, 1-3):

Ges de n' Oc-e-No no m planç,
qu' ieu sai qu' on lui non resta
la guerra ni no s' alenta,

in which Bertran praises his master for doing what the poet liked above all, i.e. making war, show that the name cannot have contained any shade of blame.

Now, some lines of Aimeric (Gr. 9, 12 = Dum. iv, ll. 41-43) are perhaps suitable to throw some light upon the matter:

Del nostre rei me plagra d' itraguo
que, per son sen, disses d' oc o de no,
aissi com pretz o requier et honransa.

The expression *dire d' oc e de no*, for which the editor gives a literal translation without explaining it either in a note or in the glossary, evidently means 'to show the right conduct'. The expression can easily have taken on that signification by passing through this other: 'to say yes and no at the right moment and remain firm in one's resolution'. Raynouard, *Lex. Rom.* iv, 357, quotes our passage together with one of Daude de Prada's 'Cardinal Virtues': 'Ab fe et ab religion Deu gardar son hoc e son non'. Here, too, a good and firm attitude is demanded in religious matters. Daude's words induce us to see the origin of the expression in the famous passage of Saint Matthew 5, 37: 'Est, est: non, non: quod autem his abundantius est, a malo est.' From the ecclesiastical atmosphere it has probably penetrated into secular use. If, then, the explanation given here for the expression *dire d' oc e de no* is true, we can see in a man who is called 'Yes-and-No' one who says 'yes' and 'no' when either of them is in its place; one who does the right thing at the right moment

and does it without hesitation. This interpretation of Richard's pseudonym would excellently fit the reputation of a man to whom his contemporaries gave the surname of Lionheart, though the portrait which modern historians have made of him may differ rather greatly from that drawn by the Middle Ages.

5. LADIES LEARNING AND PROPAGATING THEIR TROUBADOURS' POEMS

In the last stanza of Gr. 355, 7 (=Cav. VI), P. Raimon says (ll. 50 ff.):

A mon Ereubut prec e man
c' a la pro comtessa prezan
fassa ma chansonet' auzir.

In this *Ereubut*, Cavaliere sees a minstrel. Anglade (*Ann. du Midi* 31/2, 166), though not with full certainty, has preceded him in this opinion, and Bertoni (*Trovatori d' Italia*, p. 14, note 2) speaks of *Ereubut* as of a poet and friend of Peire, or even of a minstrel. The text seems to justify these opinions. Who else but a minstrel, if not the author himself, could sing the poet's song to the countess? But this passage cannot be examined without another of the same poet, who says in Gr. 355, 9 (=Cav. VIII), ll. 1-4:

No m puese sufrir d' una leu chanzo faire,
pois precx e mans n' ai de mon Ereubut,
qu' apres l' afan e-l trebaill c' ai agut
coven c' ab ioi m' esbaudey e m' esclaire.

Here, Cavaliere himself is of opinion that the pseudonym *Ereubut* refers to the poet's lady, and the text does not seem to admit any other interpretation. But is it conceivable that a poet should have employed the same name to designate alternately a minstrel and the beloved lady? Why, then, did Cavaliere hesitate to see that lady in the *Ereubut* of the first passage, too? Did he take offence at the poet's naming two ladies at once, *Ereubut* and the countess? If he has had this doubt, it can be regarded as irrelevant after Scheludko's article 'Über den Frauenkult der Troubadours' in *Neuphil. Mitteil.* xxxv, 1-40, in which that scholar (especially pp. 15 ff.) has shown that, in the poems of the troubadours, we often find two women's names, one that of the beloved lady, the other that of the poet's protectress. But Cavaliere does not express any doubt about this matter. Are we then to suppose that he was induced to think *Ereubut* a minstrel by that exhortation addressed to *Ereubut* to 'make the countess hear his poem'? But there is another passage in Peire's poems (Gr. 355, 3=Cav. II, ll. 41-3) which contains a similar exhortation:

Mon Diaman, que tenc car,
vuelh de ma chanzo pregar
qu' a Toloza la-m retraya.

Who is hidden behind that pseudonym *Mon Diaman*? Cavaliere says, very cautiously (p. 11): 'nome del personaggio cui la canzone è commessa.' But can such a name be anything else but the *senhal* for the beloved lady? So, the

two passages lead us to believe that P. Raimon really wished his poems to be propagated by his lady.¹

It is not P. Raimon alone who asked his lady such a service. Albertet de Sestaro, Gr. 16, 12 (Kolsen, *Dicht. der Trob.* p. 92), v, 3 says:

E sos gens cors douz e cars, francx e bos...
 ...aya de mi membransa,
 sivals d' aitan que mas chansos aprenda
 o al per mens² que, si'l plai, las entenda.

Here, the lady is only to 'learn' the poems, perhaps with a view to reciting or singing them to others. This intention seems to be expressed in a passage of Gaucelm Faidit, Gr. 167, 60 (Kolsen, l.c. 171, note 1), the text of which is unfortunately corrupted and incomplete. Having praised his lady in the last stanza, the poet says in the first of the tornadas:

En loc d' amic tramet ma chanson gaya
 ...³ lai, que no m' en pose aizir,
 ans cau⁴ tener per apenr' e per dir.

I believe that *lai* in the second of these lines indicates the beloved lady, as is often the case in the songs of the troubadours. Much clearer is the following passage from a poem attributed to Arnaut de Marueil, Gr. 30, 14 (Johnston, p. 161), stanza VII:

A Miramons, qu' es de tot fin pretz claus,
 ' n' anatz prezens,
 avinens
 chans valens,
 que·us aprenha
 ma dona, quar eslir
 sap be e·l mielhs chاوزir
 qu' a benestan covenha.

Here, at least, the lady is to learn the author's poem. Another troubadour,

¹ A third passage might be pleaded here. In Gr. 355, 9 (=Cav. VIII), the poet says (ll. 85 ff.):

Et ab ma chanzon,
 enanz c' alhors an,
 m' en vau lai de cors
 on Tois e Pretz reigna;
 ' e vuel que l' apregna
 cobletas viulan
 e pois en chantan
 de qual guiz' om la·i deman.

Who is the person that is to learn his song? Cavaliere thinks the poet himself, but then the latter would not have said *vuel que l' apregna* (with the same subject. 'I', for *vuel* and *apregna*), but *la vuel aprendre*. So I formerly thought of writing *qu' el' apregna* (*el'* = the lady) with commas after both *apregna* and *chantan*. But since Jeanroy (*Rom.* 63, 113) made this ingenious correction, i.e. to see in *Cobletas* the name of a minstrel who is to learn that poem—Spanke, later on, had the same idea (*Litbl.* 59, 188)—I am no longer so sure of the correctness of my interpretation, and we had better not make use of this passage in the discussion of what occupies us here.

² Kolsen has changed this *al per mens* into *altraments*; this correction is unnecessary (see Appel, *Litbl.* 38, 398).

³ Here Kolsen supplies the words *Que devon*, which I do not understand.

⁴ Kolsen corrects into *car*.

Giraut de Bornelh, makes us understand that his lady sings other poets' songs (Gr. 242, 40 = Kolsen, 47, ll. 109 ff).

Ges amors (mais no·lh pes!)
 no m' es vis, ben egalh
 e' om dezir e badalh
 e viva consuros
 e qu' ela chan
 d' altrui dolsas chansos.¹

From all these quotations we can, I think, conclude that troubadours asked their ladies, either really or fictitiously, to serve as intermediaries between themselves and their public, to play, as it were, the part of propagators of their poetical glory. So there is nothing astonishing in the lines quoted in the beginning of this chapter: P. Raimon asks his lady, concealed under the name of *Ereubut*, to bring his poem to the ears of the countess his protectress. We therefore believe that the two *Ereubuts* in Peire's poems designate the same person, i.e. the lady of the poet.²

K. LEWENT

NEW YORK

¹ For the first three lines see my explanation in *Zum Text der Lieder des G. de B.* (Bibl. dell' Arch. Rom. I, 26, p. 67). For the last line, Kolsen (I, 299, note 3) gives this interpretation: 'that, in her love-songs, she thinks of (she loves) other men'. I should rather say: 'that she sings songs of others', whom, thus, she prefers to the poet.

² This is also the opinion of Bergert, *Die von den Trobad. genannten etc. Damen*, Halle, 1913, p. 117.

PALATINUS LATINUS 1970, A COMPOSITE MANUSCRIPT

In an earlier article I asserted that Palatinus Latinus 1970 in the Vatican Library is a composite manuscript,¹ but the nature of the survey I was then attempting prevented me from presenting much of my evidence. Since the manuscript is suggestive as a piece of book-making, and since the approach I used may have some interest as methodology, I shall submit the more pedestrian portion of the evidence here.

The manuscript has been capably described.² It contains a copy of the Anglo-Norman *Manuel des Pechiez*, in two hands, ca. 1300. Since the hands were contemporary, the cataloguer attached no importance to the change in script, but several details suggest that we may have evidence here of something more than a chance change of scribes.

The break occurs at fol. 61b, col. 2, that is, at the end of a quire.³ The page looks, also, like the end of a manuscript, particularly since the last folio of each previous quire carries the first few words of the next quire, there is no such jump line at the bottom of this folio. Column 1 of the page was written full, but column 2 was not, so that the work of the first scribe comes to an end about two-thirds of the way down the column. Below is a rectangle showing erasure; it is equivalent to twelve lines of column 1, but has been re-ruled for the second scribe, who wrote a slightly smaller hand, to provide for thirteen lines. Below this erasure is a blank space that would have accommodated about three lines more, and at the top of this space are the remains of a geometrical figure, the only illumination of any sort in the manuscript.

So much for the appearance of the page; next we should look at the text involved. The last line in the first hand is 7956,⁴ 'E plus ne dirrum de peche', that is, the last line of five 'books' which treat various aspects of Sin. The six lines that have been copied into the newly ruled portion by the second hand are lines 7957-7962, which constitute an introduction to a section frequently called Book VI,⁵ and the book itself begins at the top of fol. 62. This book is admittedly no part of the original *Manuel*, but an addition that may have been

¹ 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel des Pechiez*', *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature* (1941), pp. 99-123.

² Karl Christ, *Die altfranzösischen Handschriften der Palatina; Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Heidelberger Buchersammlungen und zur Kenntnis der älteren französischen Literatur* (xLvi. Beiheft zum *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Leipzig, 1916), pp. 75-7.

³ Charlton G. Laird, 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel des Pechiez*', *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature* (1941), p. 117. Hereafter I shall refer to this study as 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*'.

⁴ Frederick J. Furnivall, *Robert of Brunne's 'Handlyng Synne'*, A.D. 1303, with those Parts of the *Anglo-French Treatise on which it was founded*, William of Wadington's '*Manuel des Pechiez*', Early English Text Society, Orig. Ser., nos. 119, 121. For passages not reprinted by the Early English Text Society I shall cite: idem, *Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne with the French Treatise on which it is founded, le Manuel des Pechiez by William of Wadington* (London: The Roxburghe Club, 1862). I shall indicate line numberings from the Roxburghe Club volume as follows: (Rox).

⁵ Lines 7793 (Rox)—8482 (Rox). Cf. *Romania*, xxix (1900), 9-21, 83-84; Johan Vising, *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature* (London, 1923), no. 154; J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (1910), III, 272-303; *Romanic Review*, VIII (1917), 434-62; 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*', *passim*, especially pp. 100, 120-3.

adapted for that work, and certainly was introduced into it.¹ It is not to be found in many extant manuscripts of the *Manuel*. Now, the palaeographic data we have already noticed suggest that the matter written into fol. 61b, col. 2 by the second copyist had not been anticipated by the first copyist. Had the first copyist expected to include Book vi, he certainly would have written the introduction to Book vi (lines 7957–62) into fol. 61b, col. 2, which was partly blank. His previous practice suggests that he would have started Book vi in this column, but if not, he surely would have added the transitional lines, so that he could start the new book on the new folio. Thus one might surmise that the first scribe had a copy of the *Manuel* without Book vi, and that the second scribe used a copy that contained Book vi.

We shall find evidence to support this guess, if we relate our manuscript to other manuscripts of the *Manuel*, of which there seem to be three groups.² Superficially the Vatican manuscript resembles group I, since that group is marked off from groups II and III by the presence of all major divisions found in the printed form of the *Manuel*, these divisions occurring in the order of the printed version; it has a distinctive form for Book vii (on Penance, line 8649 through the Latin passage which follows 11,356 (Rox)); and a rather large number of smaller characteristics. Thus, after Book v, manuscripts of group I are readily recognizable, and they are notable among the rather diverse manuscripts of the *Manuel* for their conformity to type. Now, Palatinus Latinus 1970 shares these characteristics of group I, and thus for the portion after Book v it clearly stems from group I. Through the Prologue and Books i–v, however, the situation is not so clear. Here manuscripts of group I are relatively uniform, but there are fewer large differences to distinguish them from manuscripts of groups II and III. The differences we do have, furthermore, relate the Vatican manuscript to group II, not to group I. From the Prologue significant lines (99–116), which are disturbed in manuscripts of group II, are lacking. Tale 11 (lines 2247–366), omitted from all manuscripts of group II and from no other manuscripts, is lacking, also. The line readings in Books i–v seem to be close to those of group II, even to reproducing orthography; the rubrics in these books are startlingly close to those of Harley 4971 in the British Museum,³ which certainly belongs to group II.

¹ Ibid.

² 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*', passim, especially p. 122.

³ The following are some of the more spectacular similarities; they are the more suggestive since rubrics in most manuscripts of the *Manuel* show considerable divergence. It should be noted in these comparisons that I have not seen Lord Middleton's manuscript, which probably does not stand close to Palatinus Latinus 1970, nor the Stonyhurst College fragment, which may stand close to it; for Phillipps 2223, which certainly does stand close to it, my notes are incomplete. The remaining extant manuscripts I have read entire. For conventional descriptions and citations, cf. 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*'. I shall refer to Palatinus Latinus 1970 as V, Harley 4971 as H.

Before the Prologue appears an incorrect heading: V—*Le premier article de la fey* (fol. 1a); H—*Le premier article de la fey* (fol. 93a); no other manuscript agrees. Before Tale 3 (lines 941–1070) a rubric is introduced; V—*De un moyne ke renia deu pur une femme* (fol. 8a, col. 2); H—*De un moine ke renia deu pur une femme* (fol. 96a, col. 2); not contained in any other manuscript. Before Tale 6 (lines 1591–1628) a rubric is inserted: V—*de un hum ke resigna sa tere pur sun fiz* (fol. 13b,

Let us review the evidence. At the end of Book v the hand changes. At this point, palaeographic data suggest that the first scribe thought he had finished his job; as an alternative one may assume that the scribe had finished a section of his manuscript, but did not expect to follow it with Book vi. From Book vi through the end of the Vatican manuscript the version of the *Manuel* can be equated with manuscripts of group I. From the beginning through Book v the evidence is less conclusive, but strongly suggests a manuscript of group II. At this point it should be added that manuscripts of group I usually contained Book vi, and that in 1300 they probably represented the revised and up-to-date form of the *Manuel*; on the other hand, no extant manuscript in group II contains Book vi, and there is reason to suppose that group II may stand close to an archaic form of the *Manuel* which ended shortly after Book v.¹ Thus whether we assume that the manuscript used by the first scribe ended with Book v, or whether we assume merely that the manuscript lacked Book vi and perhaps was confused thereafter, the most satisfactory explanation seems to be that the first scribe used a manuscript of group II, that the resulting copy was found incomplete when compared with a manuscript of group I, and that the second scribe used a manuscript of that group.

This theory accounts for the evidence, but the evidence itself is not so conclusive as one would wish, particularly for the first five books. A reading of these books had convinced me that the text resembled, in many small ways, the text of the manuscripts of group II, but I did not wish, in a question of this sort, to rely upon my personal impression, however strong the impression might be. Hence, I employed relatively objective data, which I had prepared for another purpose.

The manuscripts of the *Manuel* are so confused, and have been so complicated by cross correction and by multiplicity of ancestry that I was in doubt of the filiation when I relied upon samples and upon the testimony of the larger divisions of the poem. Accordingly, I attempted an objective tabulation of variants which I hoped would make readily apparent the character of each manuscript, and of each large part of a manuscript. First

col. 2); H—*De un homme ke resigna sa tere par sun fiz* (fol. 98b, col. 2); not found in any other manuscript. Rubrics for the Commandments are greatly disturbed in V and H; the manuscripts differ somewhat from each other, but they differ much more widely from all other manuscripts, and they have striking common errors. For the Fifth Commandment H has no rubric, V a rubric for the Second Commandment, for the Sixth Commandment, V and H have a common error, and call the Commandment the Fifth; similarly for the Seventh Commandment, each has a rubric for the Sixth; so for the Eighth, each has a rubric for the Seventh. In addition, V lacks rubrics for the First, Third, Fourth, Ninth, and Tenth Commandments. One suspects that an ancestor of V and H had no rubrics for the Commandments, and that they were written in. In place of the rubric for Book IV on Sacrilege, both manuscripts have rubrics for Book V on the Sacraments: V—*Ici comence de seth sacremenz* (fol. 52a, col. 1); H—*Si comence de VII sacremenz* (fol. 116a, col. 1); no other manuscript agrees. Both manuscripts change the rubric for Book V into a rubric for the first of the sacraments: V—*Le primer de seth sacrament est baptesme* (fol. 55a, col. 2); H—*Le premiere de seth sacremenz est baptesme* (fol. 117b, col. 1); no other manuscript agrees.

¹ I hope to discuss this question in a subsequent article; some of the evidence will be found in 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*'.

I collected variants on a relatively constant basis.¹ I then tabulated these variants so as to show their frequency within a manuscript, and their distribution among manuscripts. I was aware that I was relying upon a quantitative, not a qualitative gauge, but I hoped in part to obviate this difficulty by using enough variants so that differences would lose some of their importance, and by checking results against more qualitative estimates. As a matter of fact, I found that the results were so sharp and emphatic, and checked so well with other sorts of evidence, that I relied more and more upon the tabulations; they revealed relationships which I had not suspected, but for which I could find further evidence when I had been given the key.

Now, if I was right in thinking that the first scribe of *Palatinus Latinus 1970* had used a manuscript of group II, and that the second scribe had used a manuscript of group I, then this change should be apparent in the tabulation for that manuscript. The following is the tabulation for the book before, and for the two books after the change of script:²

Palatinus Latinus 1970—V

Like group I (ACGHmLORRoy)	Like group II (ArHJPhV)	Like group III (BEFPUY)
7320-3 v. ArBEFHmJPUVY	7095-7 (1 for 3) ArHJV	7177-80 ArBEFHJPUVY
7374 om. AArEFGHJOUV	7121-2 w. ArHJV	7320-3 v.
7562 w. AEFGHmORUVY	7177-80 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	ArBEFHmJPUVY
7739 w. ArBEFPRoyUVY	7320-3 v.	7374 w. AArEFGHJOUV
7753-4 w.	ArBEFHmJPUVY	7384 after it four lines ms.
ArBCEHJPPhUVY;	7374 w. AArEFGHJOUV	ArBEFHJPUVY
7749-56 w. FRoy	7384 after it, four lines ms.	7441-2 w. ArBEFHJPUV
	ArBEFHJPUVY	7562 w. AEFGHmORUVY
	7441-2 w. ArBEFHJPUV	7578 v. ArFHJUVY; cf. B
	7490-1 tr. ArHJV	7583-4 w. ArBEFHPUVY
	7541-2 v. ArHJVZ	7609-12 two ad. ArBFHUVY
	7562 w. AEFGHmORUVY	7641-2 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7578 v. ArFHJUVY; cf. B	7661-2 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7583-4 w. ArBEFHPUVY	7705-8 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7609-12 two ad. ArBFHUVY	7727-8 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7641-2 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7730-2 v. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7661-2 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7739 w. ArBEFPRoyUVY
	7705-8 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7743-6 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7727-8 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7753-4 w.
	7730-2 v. ArBEFHJPUVY	ArBCEHJPPhUVY;
	7739 w. ArBEFPRoyUVY	7749-56 w. FRoy
	7743-6 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7765-6 w. ArBEFHJPUVY
	7753-4 w.	7864-6 (1 for 3)
	ArBCEHJPPhUVY;	ArBEFHJPUVY
	7749-56 w. FRoy	7909-10 v. ArBEFHJPVY
	7765-6 w. ArBEFHJPUVY	7951-2 w.
	7864-6 (1 for 3)	ArBEFHJPPhUVY
	ArBEFHJPUVY	
	7909-10 v. ArBEFHJPVY	
	7951-2 w. ArBEFHJPPhUVY	

¹ Since they were relatively objective, I adopted the following as definitions of a 'variant': the presence of so much as one additional line; the absence of so much as one line; change of position of so much as one line; change within lines, if the change was sufficient to affect the sense materially.

² In any given entry, the number indicates the line at which the variant occurs in *Palatinus Latinus 1970*; the letters represent manuscripts in which the variant is found (cf. 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel*'). I have employed special abbreviations as follows: ad. additional line or lines; ins. inserted; tr. transposed; v. variant reading; w. wanting; figures like (1 for 3) are to be expanded

Book VI begins—Script changes

7889-93 (Rox) (3 for 5)	8749-50 w. AArCHmJORoyV	7889-93 (Rox) (3 for 5)
CEGOPUVY	8881-2 w. ArBCEFHmJOPVY	CEGOPUVY
8128-9 (Rox) w. ACGHmOV		8248-51 (Rox) w. BFV
8649 Book VII begins		8881-2 w.
ACHmLOV		ArBCEFHmJOPVY
8749-50 w. AArCHmJORoyV		9918 v. CUVY
8881-2 w. ArBCEFHmJOPVY		10362 Latin prose ms.
9439-40 w. HmV		ACEHmOPRroyUVY
9918 v. CUVY		
1005-6 tr. CHmORoyV		
10362 Latin prose ms.		
ACEHmOPRroyUVY		

Some characteristics of this tabulation might be noted. First, in Book v, that is, in the matter copied by the first scribe, the Vatican manuscript agrees most frequently with manuscripts of group III (to which group II is related), and but infrequently with manuscripts of group I. A given variant which is found in group II is likely to occur in most of the manuscripts of group II; a variant which occurs in both groups II and III is likely to occur in most of the manuscripts of those groups. A variant which occurs in group I occurs but scatteringly, as though its distribution were due to some vagary of transmission. These conditions change abruptly with the change of script. After this change the Vatican manuscript agrees most frequently with manuscripts of group I; it is inclined to agree with a large number of manuscripts of group I, and, even when a variant occurs in manuscripts of groups II, or III, the occurrence is scattering, suggesting the sort of irregularities that always confuse manuscript relationships.¹ In short, the tabulation takes the form we should expect it to take if the first copyist used a manuscript of group II and the second copyist a manuscript of group I. Barring some irregularities, which one must of course expect, Palatinus Latinus 1970 agrees with manuscripts of group II through the matter copied by the first scribe, and abruptly begins to agree with manuscripts of group I when the second scribe takes up. No other manuscript of the *Manuel* known to me shows a break in tradition anything like this; it seems to me strong evidence corroborating the testimony of the large sections of the poem and of the palaeographic data.

CHARLTON LAIRD

POCATELLO, IDAHO

so as to read 'one line for three'. Thus the first entry, '7095-7 (1 for 3) ArHJV' means that the three lines, 7095-7, have been reduced to one in the manuscripts I have called Ar (Arundel 288, British Museum), H (Harley 4971), J (St John's College, Cambridge, 197), and V (Palatinus Latinus 1970). If a variant occurs only in manuscripts of group II, it is placed in that column. If it occurs in manuscripts of both groups II and III, it is placed in both columns, and if it occurs in all groups, it is placed in all columns. The distribution within groups can be checked by comparing the occurrence of a given variant with the list of manuscripts in the group, which will be found at the top of each column. From these lists I have removed a few manuscripts which are fragmentary at this point.

¹ If one were making a study of this table, one would have to consider a number of details too complicated to treat here, which somewhat alter its character. The fact that a number of manuscripts of group II are fragmentary somewhat reduces the entries for that column; that the basis of the printed text (and hence the basis of the comparison) is a manuscript of group I somewhat reduces entries in that column. In spite of these and other qualifying circumstances, however, the tabulation probably presents a picture that is roughly accurate.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

TWO NOTES ON ÆLFRIC AND WULFSTAN

(i) *The Date of Ælfric's Death*

In 1856 Dietrich expressed the opinion that the death of the homilist Ælfric occurred between 1020 and 1025,¹ and this has been so frequently repeated, usually without any reference to Dietrich's evidence, that it is well on the way towards being accepted as ascertained fact. It seems therefore desirable to point out how slender is the evidence on which this opinion is based. Dietrich believed that Ælfric survived so long into the eleventh century solely because of the occurrence of an Abbot Ælfric among the witnesses to an Old English will (K.C.D. 972) which he dated 1020, deliberately differing from Kemble, who dated its Latin confirmation (K.C.D. 1300) 1004. Dietrich's date is given because the list of witnesses includes Archbishop Æthelnoth (1020–38), Archbishop Wulfstan (1002–23) and Bishop Ælfhun of London, whom he erroneously believed to have been alive in 1020, when in fact his successor Ælfwig was consecrated early in 1014² and signs from 1015 on. This document is no. xxii in my *Anglo-Saxon Wills* and I have discussed its date there. It has an impossible list of witnesses, including, along with the above-mentioned ecclesiastics, Ealdorman Ælfhere who died in 983 and Ealdorman Brihtnoth who was killed in 991. It is a late version from a St Paul's register which is now lost, and it is obvious that the list cannot be genuine as it stands. In the body of the document the king's name is Æthelred, and it is difficult to see why this should have been substituted for Cnut as it must have been if Dietrich's dating is correct. Possibly the St Paul's scribe eked out an original list of the first decade of the eleventh century with a sprinkling of famous persons; possibly the original will had no witnesses and this deficiency was remedied by compiling a list from at least three documents of different dates. In any case, there is no good reason for supposing that Abbot Ælfric belonged to the same list as Archbishop Æthelnoth. His immediate predecessor is Ælfhun, Bishop of London from 1004 to 1014. As evidence for the survival of the homilist as late as 1020 the document is clearly worthless.

Even if it could be proved that Archbishop Æthelnoth and Abbot Ælfric witnessed the same document, the question whether this abbot is necessarily the homilist would remain open. The name is extremely common and our knowledge of the succession of abbots to even the more important abbeys is

¹ 'Abt Aelfrik. Zur Literatur-Geschichte der angelsächsischen Kirche.' Part II. In Niedner's *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, Neue Folge xx, 247 f.

² *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 1014 D.

by no means complete. This should be borne in mind when considering other signatures claimed for him. One of these can be easily dismissed, namely, the alleged occurrence of his attestation to the Eynsham foundation charter of 1005.¹ The better text given by Salter² shows that Kemble's *Ælfric* is *Ælfrie* in the manuscript, and this is an error for *Ælfsige* both here and later on in the list, Anglo-Saxon *s* and *r* being easily confused. Two abbots called *Ælfsige* normally witness charters of this period. It is not remarkable that the newly appointed abbot does not witness the foundation charter of his abbey. The same is true at the almost contemporary foundation of Burton-on-Trent, where the abbot, Wulfgeat, is not one of the witnesses to the foundation charter of 1004 (K.C.D. 710).

Another signature has been attributed to the homilist by Dietrich, that of an abbot who witnesses a royal charter (K.C.D. 1307) of July 1012, dealing with lands in Oxfordshire. It is clear that it was witnessed by a gathering of the witan, but we are not told where. It does not follow that the Abbot *Ælfric* belongs to the same locality as the estates granted, any more than the other abbots, who probably represent the houses of Thorney, the New Minster at Winchester, either Ely or Peterborough, and Evesham. Wulfgar of Abingdon is there, but as he witnesses almost every charter of the period, we need not assume he is here in the capacity of a local abbot. It is possible that the Abbot *Ælfric* of this charter is identical with the one who witnesses a charter in favour of Evesham in 1016 (K.C.D. 723), not mentioned by Dietrich, no doubt because Kemble marked it as doubtful. It is true that its list of witnesses starts unpromisingly, after the king's name, with Archbishop Dunstan (died 988); but apart from this name and the title of bishop, instead of archbishop, given to Lifing (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1013–20), the list fits the year 1016 so well that it can hardly be the work of a late forger. Probably the scribe of the cartulary has substituted Dunstan for Wulfstan (Archbishop of York, 1002–23) and therefore deprived Lifing of his correct title, realizing that there could not be two archbishops of Canterbury. If we make this adjustment, the list can be dated as after 1012, the date of the accession of *Ælfsige* to Winchester,³ of *Æthelstan* to Hereford and of *Brihtmer* to the Abbey of Newminster, Winchester, and before the death of the Ealdorman *Ælfric* in 1016. All the other identifiable witnesses are in agreement with this date and the indiction is correct for the date given in the charter.

In both these charters the signature of Abbot *Ælfric* follows immediately on that of Abbot Wulfgar, and as both texts are from later cartularies, we may suspect confusion, as in the Eynsham charter, with the Abbot *Ælfsige* who occupies this position in a number of charters about this time. There is

¹ K.C.D. 714.

² *Eynsham Cartulary*, ed. by H. E. Salter in *Oxford Historical Society Publications*, xlix, 19 ff.

³ See A. J. Robertson, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, p. 393.

however, one document attested by an Abbot Ælfric which was unknown to Dietrich, and this survives in a contemporary version and so is not open to the above explanation. It is a royal charter to Archbishop Ælfstan of Canterbury, dated 1018 and witnessed by three abbots, Ælfric being one.¹

Thus it is established that an Abbot Ælfric was alive in 1018, and it is possible that he is the witness of the 1012 and 1016 charters; but it is very doubtful whether he can safely be identified with the homilist. Eynsham was not an important house, whose abbot would naturally attend the meetings of the witan. There are gaps in the lists of abbots of several abbeys, including Chertsey, Pershore, Muchelney and Milton Abbas, at this time. Athelney had an Abbot Ælfric about 1007,² and there is no reference to another abbot until mention is made of an Æthelwine about 1023.³ Matthew Paris has an Ælfric in his history of the abbots of St Albans who is generally assumed to be merely a duplication of the earlier abbot of this name, who became Bishop of Ramsbury in 990 and later Archbishop of Canterbury;⁴ if this second Ælfric ever existed, his abbacy must be placed about this time. In any case it seems clear that our knowledge of the succession of abbots in the early eleventh century is too fragmentary for any certain identification with the homilist to be made.

We are therefore thrown back on the internal evidence of the works. None of these can be dated with certainty later than the homily *In natale unius confessoris* which he dedicated to Æthelwold II, Bishop of Winchester from 1006 to 1012, for Dietrich's opinion that the second pastoral letter for Wulfstan was issued in 1014 or later is based on an error.⁵ Most of Ælfric's work can be dated before 1007, the major works belonging mainly to the period before he came to Eynsham in 1005. His *De Vetere et Novo Testamento* was long enough after this event for him to have become closely acquainted with the Oxfordshire thane Sigwerd, and his letter to the Warwickshire thane Wulfgeat of Ilmington need not be as early as 1006, a date which depends on the identification of this Wulfgeat with Æthelred's favourite whose estates were forfeited in this year, an identification for which there is no evidence. But even if we give a late date to these two works, there is very little to fill the long period between the *Vita S. Athelwoldi* in 1006 and the normally accepted date of his death. We should have to suppose that he almost ceased from literary activity during the latter part of his life. It would, of course, be difficult to disprove this, but it seems at least as likely a hypothesis that Ælfric's death occurred many years earlier than has been assumed.

¹ *Ordnance Survey Facsimiles*, III, no. 39.

² *Somerset Record Society Publications*, XIV, 147.

³ *Ibid.*, XIV, 141. Cf. A. J. Robertson, *op. cit.*, pp. 412 f.

⁴ See *Victoria County History of Hertfordshire*, IV, 370 f.

⁵ B. Fehr, *Die Hertenbriefe Ælfrics (Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, IX)*, pp. xlvii ff., lxxviii.

(ii) *Gildas, Alcuin and Wulfstan.*

In my edition of the *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*,¹ I suggested that when Wulfstan refers to Gildas as his authority for the sinful state of the Britons at the time of the English invasion and draws a moral for his contemporaries, he owes a debt to Alcuin's letters such as the one published in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, III, 510. There is, however, another of Alcuin's letters on the same theme which is certainly Wulfstan's immediate source. It is addressed to Archbishop Æthelheard and contains the following passage:

Legitur vero in libro Gildi Bretonum sapientissimi, quod idem ipsi Bretones *propter rapinas et avaritiam principum, propter iniquitatem et iniustitiam iudicum, propter desidiam et pigritiam praedicationis episcoporum, propter luxuriam et malos mores populi patriam perdidierunt* Caveamus haec eadem nostris temporibus vitia inolescere; quatenus benedictio divina nobis patriam conservet in prosperitate bona, quam nobis in sua misericordia perdonare dignata est.²

Wulfstan translates very freely, expands and alters to suit his purpose, but the debt remains clear, as will be seen on comparing the italicized passages:

An peodwita was on Brytta tidum, Gildas hatte, se awrat be heora misdædum, hu hy mid heora synnum swa oferlice swyþe God gegræmedan þæt he let æt nyhstan Engla here heora eard gewinnan 7 Brytta dugeþe forðon mid ealle. 7 þæt was geworden, þæs þe he sæde, þurh ricra reafþlac 7 þurh gitsunge wohgestreona, þurh leode umlaga 7 þurh wohdomas, þurh biscopa asolcennesse 7 þurh lyðre yrhðe Godes byðela, þe soþes geswugedan ealles to gelome 7 clumedan mid ceafum þær hy souldan clypian. þurh fulne eac folces gælsan 7 þurh oferfylla 7 mænigfealde synna heora eard hy forworhtan 7 selfe hy forwurðan. Ac wutan don swa us pearf is, warnian us be swilcan.³

Alcuin's letter is contained in three manuscripts connected with Wulfstan,⁴ Cotton Vespasian A. XIV and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 265 and 190, and in the last this particular sentence⁵ is copied separately on another folio, to be soon followed by the Latin passage *De tribulationibus*,⁶ probably used by Wulfstan for his *Sermo*. This suggests that he collected and recorded material for this homily as we know that he did for others.⁷

A point of interest arises out of the comparison of this Old English passage with its Latin source. I have quoted it from the version in Nero A. 1. The Hatton text, which most editors have taken as the basis of their text, has several phrases scattered through the homily which do not occur in other manuscripts. Thus in the passage under discussion it adds *þurh gelæredra regolbryce 7 ðurh læwedra lahbryce* after *þæs þe he sæde* and *7 unsnotornesse*

¹ Methuen's Old English Library, 1939, p. 41 note.

² M.H.G., Abt. IV, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, 47.

³ Ll. 184 ff. of my edition.

⁴ See my 'Archbishop Wulfstan, Homilist and Statesman' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th series, XXIV, 30 ff.

⁵ See M. Bateson, *E.H.R.* x, 718. While the manuscript remains inaccessible one cannot be sure just how much was extracted.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 731.

⁷ See K. Jost in *Anglia*, LVI, 265 ff.

after *þurh biscopa asolcennesse*. There is nothing equivalent in the Latin original, an indication that the additional matter does not go back to the author's first draft.¹

DOROTHY WHITELOCK

OXFORD

WAS 'TRESON' IN THE 'CHRONICLE'?

It will be recalled that the Peterborough continuator wrote (s a. 1135):

On þis gære for se king Henri ouer sæ æt te Lammasse. 7 ð oper dei þa he lai an slep in scip. *þa þestrede þe dæi ouer al landes*, 7 uard þe sunne suile als it uware threniht ald mone. an sterres abuten him at middæi. Wurpen men suðe of uundred 7 of dred, 7 sæden ð micel þing sculde cumen herefter. sua dide. for þat ilc gær warth þe king ded.... *þa westre sona þas landes*. for æuricman sone ræuede oper þe mihte.

Plummer had no emendation for the meaningless *westre* to suggest when he published the text but, before his volume of notes appeared, Emerson had proposed, by a simple redivision: *wes treson a...*, to give an acceptable meaning to the phrase, and Plummer at once welcomed and adopted the suggestion.

When he originally proposed the new reading Emerson had seen neither the MS. nor a facsimile, but in 1916 he contributed a short note to this journal (XI, 460) stating that inspection of a facsimile had convinced him of 'the reasonableness of the reading'. The year following Bradley (XII, 72), while acknowledging the brilliance of the suggestion, demurred to it on contextual grounds. Instead, attracted by the 'suspicious resemblance in outward form' of the two phrases italicized above, he proposed to read: *þa [þ]estre[den]...*, taking the verb in a figurative sense, a use which did not commend itself to Emerson (XII, 490).

Recently I have been reading the Peterborough history of Hugo Candidus² and have been struck by the fact that the passage in Hugo corresponding to the entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* lends very considerable support to Bradley's suggestion. The passage, which also illustrates the relationship of the two texts, reads:

In altero autem anno et alio die post festiuitatem sancti Petri qui dicitur ad uincula, rex [Henricus] mare transfretauit et in naui sex[ta] hora obdormiuit, et sicut scriptum est in pluribus locis subito illa hora *celi contenebrati sunt*, et sol factus est quasi esset luna, tribus uel quatuor horis, et stelle apparuerunt, et plurimi dixerunt hoc portentum magnam rem significare. Et uerum dixerunt, quia eodem anno defunctus est rex et ceciderunt cum eo omnes senes et sapientes. *Tunc contenebrata est terra*, quia pax et ueritas et iusticia de terra ablate sunt.

ALEXANDER BELL

PETERBOROUGH

¹ Miss D. Bethurum's article, 'Archbishop Wulfstan's Common-place Book' (*P.M.L.A.*, LVII, 916 ff.), reached me only when this article was at press.

² Mr W. T. Mellows had an edition in hand which was to have been published on behalf of the Friends of Peterborough Cathedral; the war has caused the suspension of this project, but he has kindly placed the proofs of his text at my disposal.

THE RHYMING OF STRESSED WITH UNSTRESSED SYLLABLES
IN ELIZABETHAN VERSE

Metrists do not notice a peculiar form of rhyme-variation found from time to time in Elizabethan verse. Here are two examples from Donne.

the Hold and Wast
With a salt dropsie clog'd, and all our tacklings
Snapping, like too-high-stretched treble strings.

The Storme, 54-6.

And jolly Statesmen, which teach how to tie
The sinewes of a cities mistique bodie.

Satyre I, 7, 8.

In these couplets the rhyme shifts awkwardly from a stressed to an unstressed syllable.

Professor Pierre Legouis has briefly discussed this practice of Donne; he thought there was a stress-shift, and that Donne pronounced 'tacklings', 'body'. 'I think it is far more likely', he writes, 'that Donne offered violence here to the language than to the metrical design.'¹ But then the metrical design suffers too because of the additional syllable between the last two stresses.

Mr Arnold Stein's exhaustive article on 'Donne and the Couplet' in *P.M.L.A.* for September 1942,² suggests more happily that Donne was cultivating a natural manner of colloquial speech and 'securing variety by evading the full return of the rhyme-sound'. Mr Stein submits to a close analysis all Donne's devices to vary the movement of the line and to give it a freedom not found in the verse of his contemporaries. But the variation we are discussing was not confined to Donne, and further illustration is desirable.

Samuel Daniel, in *A Defence of Rhyme*, 1603,³ touched on the question, but not very satisfactorily: 'who knowes not that we can not kindly answere a feminine number with a masculine Ryme, or (if you will so tearme it) a *Trochee* with a *Sponde*, as *Weaknes* with *Confesse*, *Nature* and *Indure*, onely for that thereby we shall wrong the accent, the chiefe Lord and graue Gouvernour of Numbers?' What did Daniel mean by spondee in this passage? If he thought a spondee was stressed thus, --', he should have said 'iamb'. Again, was he thinking of strictly ten-syllable lines such as Donne's

Hee keepes, and gives to me his deaths conquest.
This Lambe, whose death, with life the world hath blest.

Holy Sonnet, xvi.

Here 'conquest' is a trochee, 'hath blest' is an iambic foot. Lines in which a feminine rhyme adds an extra final syllable would have been a further offence to Daniel's fastidious ear, and we should have expected him to criticize them.

¹ *Donne the Craftsman*, pp. 86-7.

² Vol. LVII, no. 3. He quotes some twenty-five examples.

³ *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. Gregory Smith, II, p. 379.

We have noted this licence in three Elizabethan dramatists, which is sufficient to show that it was recognized in the poetry of the period. It is interesting to note that Marlowe and Shakespeare avoid it.

The following examples are from Peele's *The Arraignement of Paris*, 1584, in the Malone Society's reprint of 1910:

Where *Phoebe* meanes to make this meeting royall,
 Haue I prepared to welcome them withall. (145-6)
 That shall not neede: they are at hand by this,
 And the conductor of the trayne hight *Rhanis*.
Iuno hath left her chariot long agoe,
 And hath returned her Peacocks by her rainebowe. (149-52)
 Accountes more honoure done to her this day,
 Then euer whilom in these woods of *Ida*. (220-1)
 But wende we on, and, *Rhanis*, leade the way,
 That kens the paynted pathes of pleasunt *Ida*. (250-1)
 But pray you tell me, *Iuno*, was it so,
 As *Pallas* tolde me here the tale of *Eccho*. (346-7)
 Yf then this prize be but bequeathed to beautye,
 The only shee that wins this prize, am I. (403-4)¹
 Most heauenly dames, was neuer man as I
 Poore shepherde swaine, so happy and vnhappy. (550-1)
 Yf as my office bids, my selfe first brings
 To my sweet Madame these vnwelcome tydings. (822-3)
 And craue this grace of this immortall senate,
 That yee allowe the man his aduocate.
Pal. That may not be, the lawes of heauen denie,
 A man to pleade or answers by attorney. (921-4)
 Nay, gods, I troe you are like to haue great silence,
 Vnles this parrot be commaunded hence. (933-4)
 I graunt ye may agree, but be content
 To doubt vpon regarde of your agreement. (1060-1)
 We here dismissee thee hence, by order of our senate:
 Goe take thy way to *Troie*, and there abide thy fate. (1077-8)
 But, Ladies, vnder fauour of your rage,
 How ere it be, yow play vppon the vauntage. (1101-2)
 (Nor thincke yee gods my speeche doth devogate
 From sacred powre of this immortall senate.) (1140-1)
 This time we will attend, and in the meane while
 With some sweete songe the tediousnes beguile. (1302-3)
 So *Pallas* yeeldes the prayse hereof to thee,
 For wisdom, princely state, and peerelesse beautie. (1353-4)

This type of rhyme is common in Chapman. The following are from his poem, *The Shadow of Night*, 1594:

And Eagle-like dost with thy starrie wings,
 Beate in the foules, and beasts to Somnus lodgings. (B ij verso)
 Prisons in flesh, and that poore flesh in bands
 Of stone, and steele, chiefe flowrs of vertues Garlands. (ibid.)
 With becks, rebukes the winds before his carre,
 Where she aduans; beates downe with cloudie mace,
 The feeble light to blacke Saturnias pallace. (C i recto)

¹ Repeated 409-10, 425-6.

Wrought in the speaking pourtrait of thy face,
Great Cynthia, rise out of thy Latmian pallace, (C.ij verso)
but in right prefers
Our native robes (put on with skilfull hands
English heroicks) to those antick garlands. (C.ij verso)
Yet bring the Princhest, and hardest beasts,
That gaue chiefe fame to those Ortygian forests, (D.ij recto)
These holy monuments: but pillars stand,
Where every Grace, and Muse shall hang her garland. (E.1 verso)
so thy sacred traine,
Thrise mightie Cynthia should be frozen dead,
To all the lawlesse flames of Cupids Godhead. (E.ij recto)
Looke with thy fierce aspect, be terror-strong;
Assume thy wondrous shape of halfe a furlong: (E.ij verso)

Finally, there are a few examples in Ben Jonson:

To these farre distant, and vn-equall'd skies,
This squared Circle of œlestiaall bodies
The Masque of Blacknesse, 120-1
Diuine OCEANVS, 'tis not strange at all,
That (since the immortall soules of creatures mortall, *Ibid., 123-4*
But, what's the end of thy *Herculean* labors,
Extended to these calme, and blessed shores? *Ibid., 132-3*
goe about
To rauish all Religion. If there be
A Power, like REASON, left in that huge Bodie, *Hymenææ, 122-4*
And GILES would neuer,
By his free will, be in IONES company.
No more would IONE he should. GILES riseth early, *Epigram XLII, 4-6*
Hath chang'd his soule, and made his obiect you:
Where finding so much beautie met with vertue, *Ibid., cxiv, 5, 6*
This wherry had no saile, too; ours had none:
And in it, two more horrid knaues, then CHARON. *Ibid., cxxxiii, 11, 12*

It is strange that a discord, as we imagine this to be, should have been allowed to obtrude itself among the harmonies of Elizabethan verse. But Professor Sisson suggests a possibility which may indicate its origin and help to explain it: was there in this period a much less marked difference between stressed and unstressed syllables? 'Forest', for instance, commonly spelt 'forrest' in the seventeenth century: was this what Daniel would have called a spondee? But, even with this explanation, the additional syllable of the trochee is not accounted for; that it was accepted as normal the list of examples we have quoted fully proves.

PERCY SIMPSON

OXFORD

THE 59TH ENGLISH BALLADE OF CHARLES OF ORLEANS

A recent publication¹ has given us at last a scholarly edition of Charles of Orleans's English poems, and its introduction raises again the questions of their authorship and of the priority of English or French if Charles be the

¹ *The English Poems of Charles of Orleans*, edited from the MS. Brit. Mus. Harl. 682, by Robert Steele, E.E.T.S., Original Series, 215, Oxford University Press, 1941.

author. A clue to the answers may perhaps be found in the 59th ballade which has no French counterpart. The editor remarks.¹

Ballades 58, 59, and 60, still lamenting her death,² do not appear in the French; quite reasonably so, for their note of true feeling would have overweighted the scheme of the French sequence, but anyone holding the theory of an English translator will have to explain his interpolation of three Ballades rather better than the ones he had before him.

Whilst the latter part of this furnishes a good argument in favour of the priority of the English, the first part assumes what appears to me doubtful, i.e. that the ballades arose purely out of Charles's grief at the death of the unknown lady. If the assumption be incorrect, then we must find some other reason for its omission from the French sequence.

Of the three ballades mentioned by the editor, the 59th affords a useful clue. In it we can, I think, trace a definite literary origin. The opening line and the refrain would suggest the influence of Christine de Pisan. 'Alone am y and wille to be alone', the poem begins. Is this not quite clearly Christine's 'Seulete sui et seulete vueil estre'? Here it must be borne in mind that this poem of hers, composed after her widowhood at the age of 25, attracted the attention of the French literary world: its note of sincere grief was something new to French society. Again, Charles was always strongly under the influence of Christine's personality. Champion tells us that he met her at his father's house:

Dans la maison de son père, il avait pu rencontrer Froissart, Christine de Pisan, Boucicaut, Eustache Deschamps,³

reminding us later that:

dans ses premières compositions, le poète se montre rempli du souvenir de Machault et de Christine.⁴

Elsewhere, listing the authors whom Charles read in his old age, he includes Christine de Pisan:

Ecrits des Pères, ouvrages de droit, livres de médecine, rhéteurs ou poètes de l'Antiquité... chroniques, Roman de la Rose, œuvres de Christine, de Froissart, d'Eustache Deschamps, d'Alain Chartier....⁵

With this evidence before us we cannot fail to take account of the similarity between the opening lines of the two poems mentioned.

Allowing for the difference in the genius of the two languages and for the extra length of the English strophe, we can trace throughout the first stanza the reflexion of Christine's famous poem in Charles's verse:

Alone am y and wille to be alone
Alone withouten plesere or gladnes
Alone in care to sighe and grone
Alone to wayle the deth of my maystres

¹ Introd., p. xxxi.

² I.e. the death of the unknown lady with whom Charles was in love during his imprisonment in England. According to Champion, *Hist. poétique du XVe s.*, II, 23, she must have been an Englishwoman, possibly the wife of Robert Waterton or of Suffolk.

³ *Hist. poét. du XVe s.*, II, 21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Alone which sorow wille me neuyr cesse
 Alone y curse the lif y do endure
 Alone this fayntith me my gret distres
 Alone y lyue an ofcast creature.

5

The first line is obviously Christine's 'Seulete sui et seulete vueil estre'. The second surely connects with her fourth line 'Seulete sui, dolente et courroucée', the third with her fifth 'Seulete sui, en langueur messaisiee', the fourth with her third 'Seulete sui, sanz compaignon ne maistre', the sex being changed for Charles's purposes. And is not Charles's refrain 'Alone y lyue an ofcast creature' Christine's 'Seulete sui sanz ami demouree'? Again, just as Christine begins each line of her strophes with 'Seulete sui', so Charles begins every line with 'Alone'. In the *envoi* Charles begins:

Alone of woo y haue take such excesse
 Alone that phisik nys ther me to cure....

This passage to the description of the physical effects of his grief corresponds to Christine's passage to the same topic:

Seulete sui de tout duel menaciee,
 Seulete sui plus teinte que moree....

even though the effects described do not bear the same stress.

There seems little doubt that, in writing his ballade, Charles was conscious of his French 'model', as indeed was only natural since her poem was the most famous of complaints in his native language. True his development after the first strophe is not that of Christine. Her resignation, her restraint, her gentle insistence upon her loneliness are those of a woman. Charles is much more the traditional lover, in the best knightly style. We must not forget that, for the knights of this period, love was fashionable, and love-poetry a courtly pastime. Indeed, in this connexion it is important to recall that the poets of Charles's court, including the duke himself, were the creators of the 'Amoureux de l'Observance', an order modelled on the reformed Franciscans,¹ taking as its aim voluntary suffering in the cause of love.²

All this tends to suggest that the 59th ballade may be little more than a literary exercise. Be that as it may, we can perhaps draw from it some idea of the language in which the poem was first written, since the supporters of the 'English translator' theory might well argue that the interpolated poems were translations of French poems by another author.

Apart from the argument used by Steele, there is a point which leads us to think that the poem is not a translation from the French. Allowing that Christine de Pisan's poem is the starting-point of the English ballade, we may ask ourselves what was the situation with regard to the imitating of known poems. For many fifteenth-century writers in France, imitation was a natural form of flattery. Others, where they disagreed with the sentiments of an author, modelled a reply upon the original. Normally the verse-form used was

¹ This refers to the reform carried out in Italy in the fourteenth century.

² Chastelain, Olivier de la Marche and Vaillant have all written *rondeaux* about this group of poets.

that of the original, although occasionally it might be a doubled version of it. In the case of Chastelain's *Lyon Rampant*, for instance, we have four imitations, all following exactly the same versification as Chastelain's poem. Had Charles or any other Frenchman written a French ballade based on that of Christine, with its tell-tale first line, it is probable that he would have used the same verse-form as hers: it is, at all events, unlikely that he would have changed a seven-line strophe into an eight-line one.

If that is so, then we can rule out the likelihood of there having existed a French original either by Charles or by some other author which an Englishman used and inserted into his 'translation'. We would then be left, if the 'translator' theory be correct, with the supposition that Charles is not the author of the ballade (which in view of the Christine connexion would be a rash assumption) or that the 'translator' proved a poet on his own account, knowing Christine's poem so well as to embroider upon it rather than translate it. The easier solution and, to my mind, the more probable, is that Charles of Orleans is himself the author, and that he wrote it in English where he could have it accepted as entirely original, whether sincere or not. In such a case, unless he had been willing to rewrite it, he would naturally have removed it from a French sequence.

KENNETH URWIN

CARDIFF

FIVE RILKE LETTERS, HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED

These letters came into my possession some time ago and are referred to by Professor E. M. Butler in her book on Rilke (Cambridge University Press, 1941). They belong to a period in Rilke's life about which comparatively little is known and have so far not been printed.¹ They are addressed to Heinrich Teweles (1856-1927), who at that time was Secretary of the Concordia, Verband deutscher Schriftsteller in Böhmen. In 1900 he became Chief Editor of the *Prager Tageblatt* and in 1911 Director of the Deutsches Landestheater in Prague. He wrote a number of novels and plays, but is probably remembered only by his completed version, performed and published in 1895, of Hebbel's unfinished drama *Demetrios*.²

I

Schmargendorf bei Berlin

Villa Waldfrieden, am 27. Oct. 1899.

Sehr verehrter Herr Teweles,

Der Jahresbetrag pro 1899 (Concordia) wird Ihnen dieser Tage zugehen. Zugleich bitte ich Sie aber, mich vom 1. Januar 1900 an, nicht mehr als "Genossen" der "Concordia" führen zu wollen. Ich werde noch einige Zeit im Ausland bleiben, und überdies reimt sich mein Taschengeld und die kleinen Einnahmen darüber hinaus so schlecht mit allen derartigen Ausgaben, daß ich auch aus dem Schriftsteller-Verband³ und der Freien litt. Gesellschaft eben austrete. Bitte dies gutigst zur Kenntnis zu nehmen. In bester Hochachtung grüßt Sie ergebenst:

Rainer Maria Rilke

¹ Cf. *Rilkes Briefe, 1899-1914*, 6 vols., Leipzig, Insel Verlag, 1930 ff.

² Reprinted as no. 3438 in Reclams *Universal Bibliothek*.

³ Verband der deutschen Schriftsteller in Böhmen.

II

Schmargendorf bei Berlin

Villa Waldfrieden, am 2. Nov. 1899

Sehr verehrter Herr Teweles,

Danke für diese Worte des Vertrauens, die mich sehr heimatlich und lieb berühren. Danke auch für die Broschüre, die so voll ist von jugendlicher Begeisterung. Was Sie mir wünschen, ist sehr in meinem Sinn,—allein ich fürchte, ich bin von den Auflagen noch ebenso weit wie von den Tantiemen und gar nicht auf dem Weg, dem einen oder dem andern näher zu kommen. Auf einem ganz andern Weg! Einem sehr einsamen. Mit den herzlichsten Grüßen Ihr

ganz ergebener

Rainer Maria Rilke

Zugleich per Postanweisung M 10.— die letzten wahrscheinlich bis zu der von Ihnen gewünschten Erfüllung!

III

Sehr geehrter Herr Teweles,

Ich komme mit einer Bitte. Gestatten Sie einige erklärende Vorbemerkungen.

Ich stehe mitten in einer schweren Zeit, die meine Arbeit gefährdet und meine Gesundheit bedroht. Sie wissen, ich habe kaum ein liebes Heim geschaffen, in der Stille,—wohl fühlend, daß Heim und Einsamkeit meiner Kunst nothig sind. Ich habe eine liebe Frau, eine kleine Tochter,—Stille—und Arbeitslust: aber da, gerade da,—will es ein unseliger Zufall, daß eine regelmäßige Unterstützung von Haus, von der wir vorläufig noch hauptsächlich gelebt haben, fortfällt und die tagliche Noth mich zwingt, mir und den Meinen irgendwie Brot zu schaffen—irgendwie. Ich habe nach allen möglichen Seiten ausgefragt—und bin bereit alles, was jetzt um mich ist, unausgenutzt und bangen Herzens zu verlassen, um irgendwo eine Stelle anzunehmen. Aber übernacht laßt sich eine solche nicht finden, und ich werde wohl noch eine Weile warten müssen. Inzwischen thue ich das Möglichste mich hier zu behaupten: da ich aber in eine Stellung nicht einspringen kann, die meine schwache Gesundheit zerstört oder mich ganz meiner Arbeit entzieht, ist auch diese Zeit, als Wartezeit, sehr sorgenvoll.

Da denke ich, vielleicht ganz mit Unrecht, aber ich denke: (ich bin Mitglied der "Concordia", Sie selbst haben es mir geschrieben, daß ich es bin und bleibe.) Kann mir die Concordia nicht helfen? Durch ein Darlehen von 300–500 Mark, durch welches die argste Angst von mir genommen werden konnte, für den Moment? Ein Darlehen zahlbar auf unbestimmte Zeit?—Ich fühle, daß das eine Wendung für mich ist, die ihre Wirklichkeit hat und, daß ich gerade jetzt nicht von kleinlichen Sorgen mich ganz aufzehren lassen darf, wo ich bei einiger Ruhe etwas schreiben konnte, was vielleicht wirklich weiterhilft. Es fällt mir nicht leicht, diesen Brief zu schreiben: ein lieber Freund rath mir dazu. Nehmen Sie ihn mir nicht übel, und, wenn Sie können, schreiben Sie ein Wort Gute Ihrem

immer aufrichtig ergebener:

Rainer Maria Rilke.

Westerwede bei Worpswede, am 23. Jan. 1902

(über Bremen)

IV

Westerwede bei Worpswede (über Bremen)

am 25. Jan. 1902

Sehr verehrter Herr Teweles,

vorgestern habe ich Ihnen, aus vielen bedrangten Tagen heraus, ein vertrauliches Wort geschrieben und gestern kommt eine Karte Orliks, die mir mitteilt, daß mir auf der letzten Ausschußsitzung das Schriftstellerstipendium der "Concordia" im Betrage von Fl. Ö. W.¹ 200.— verliehen worden ist.

Sie, der im Besitze meines Briefes von neulich sind, werden am Besten ermessen, wie ich diese private Nachricht begrüßt habe und was diese liebe heimatliche Hülfe mir gerade jetzt, gerade in diesen sorgenvollen Tagen, bedeutet. Ich warte die offizielle Verständigung nicht ab und sage Ihnen persönlich heute schon von meiner Freude und meiner Dankbarkeit, für die treue Theilnahme der Heimat an meinem Schicksal,—an dessen Wendung ich—wenn ich nicht ganz ohne Hülfe bleibe—voll Zuversicht bauen will. Wenn nur meine Arbeit oben bleibt!

In herzlicher dankbarer Ergebenheit

Ihr: Rainer Maria Rilke.

¹ Ö. W. = Österreichische Währung.

V

Westerwede bei Worpswede (über Bremen),
am 27. Jan. 1902

Sehr verehrter Herr Teweles,

ich bestätige den Empfang von Fl. O. W. 200., die mir mit heutiger Post zugegangen sind. Wenn ich schon vorgestern Gelegenheit nahm, Ihnen privatim zu sagen, *was* mir diese grosse Hilfe in diesem Augenblick bedeutet,—so bitte ich Sie heute, als Geschäftsleiter der "Concordia", in der nächsten Sitzung dem Ausschuss der Gesellschaft meinen aufrichtigen und freudigen Dank zu vermitteln. Wenn mein Weg auch ein stiller und einsamer ist, so hat er doch nicht aus dem Bereich dessen geführt, was die Freunde in der Heimat guthiessen, und kein fremder Schatten hat mich den Augen derer entzogen, die meine ersten Schritte gutig und ermunternd begleitet haben: zum Zeichen dafür nehme ich diese willkommene Hilfe dankbar an und als einen Grundstein der stillen und tüchtigen Zukunft, die ich mir ernstlich aufrichten will in ehrlicher Arbeit, Tag für Tag.

Empfangen Sie, verehrter Herr Teweles, die warmsten Grüsse Ihres

herzlich ergebenen:

Rainer Maria Rilke.

The first four letters are written in German script, the fifth in Latin characters, in Rilke's beautiful clear hand.

H. G. FIEDLER

OXFORD

A NOTE ON THE SOURCE OF 'PETER SCHLEMIHL'

At the beginning of the nineteenth century many young men from every part of the world were drawn to Paris. The new idea of freedom, the study of the Code Napoléon, the art treasures which Denon had brought to the French capital from numerous campaigns and put on public exhibition, all held out the greatest attraction. There was also the Bibliothèque Nationale which was considerably more comprehensive than any other library on the Continent.

In the spring of 1810 the young poet Adalbert von Chamisso came to Paris, where he met several friends from Berlin. Among these was the writer Varnhagen, who introduced him to the poet Ludwig Uhland. Both Chamisso and Uhland took great interest in folklore. This mutual bent soon established a very friendly relationship between them. 'Comme on le pouvait prévenir ils ne tardèrent pas à se sentir en pleine intimité', says René Riegel in his excellent life of Chamisso (3 vols., Paris, 1934). Uhland kept a careful diary of his stay in Paris and the use he made of his time. (It has been edited by J. Hartmann, Stuttgart, 1893.) The following is a verbatim quotation from it:

Sodann bis zum 3. Juni: Besuch der Museen, der Kirche Notre Dame, des Manuskripten-depots der Bibliothek:

- 5. Juni: Erster Gang zu den gedruckten Büchern der Kaiserlichen Bibliothek.
- 16. Juni: Auf der Bibliothek Abschrift des Marchens vom verkauften Schatten.—
- 19. Juni: Beendigung des Auszugs aus dem Katalog der Bibliothek.
- 2. Juli: Erste Zusammenkunft mit Chamisso auf der Galerie
- 9. Juli: Neuangefangenes Manuskript auf der Bibliothek Nr. . . .
- Diner mit Chamisso bei Lambert und übriger Abend mit ihm—
- Die Romanze 'La Fille du Roy d'Espagne'.
- 23. Juli: Abends bei Chamisso vor seiner Abreise nach Chaumont.

Thus we are informed that Uhland took a copy of a tale 'vom verkauften Schatten' on 16 June. No existing account, neither the very accurate German one, *Peter Schlemihls Schicksale* von Helmuth Rogge (5. Buch der Januspresse, Inselverlag Leipzig, 1922), nor the above-mentioned book by René Riegel, mentions the fact that in Paris a tale of a *sold* shadow exists, whereas every other shadow-motif on record is described in detail, the reference being in each case to a *lost* shadow. It is the *sold* shadow, however, that is the novelty in *Peter Schlemihl*.

It would be conclusive evidence to find the tale in the manuscript department of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.

We may take it for granted that Uhland and Chamisso spoke about the tale which Uhland had copied out, since Chamisso was interested in the Schlemihl-motif: after having finished *Adalberts Fabel* in 1806 he intended to write a 'Schlemihl' for his friend Anna Maria Assing (cf. Riegel, II, 7). Their close collaboration becomes evident when we compare some of their notes. For instance, Uhland writes in his diary on 9 August, 'Die Romanze "La Fille du Roy d'Espagne"'; on 18 June, Chamisso sends the ballad 'La Fille du Roy d'Espagne' to Rosa Maria Assing, sister of Varnhagen (see Chamisso's correspondence, edited by Eduard Hitzig, 1842, I, 291); on 24 June he writes to her, 'I am collecting French folksongs and want to do something with them some day'; Chamisso came to Paris with a *Fortunat* manuscript and in Uhland's works we also find a *Fortunat*.

On 23 July, according to his diary, Ludwig Uhland saw Chamisso once more before the latter left Paris for Chaumont-sur-Loire, the château that was the refuge of Madame de Stael and her friends after she had been banished from Paris. On 30 August Chamisso writes to his friend Wilhelm Neumann in Berlin (see above-mentioned correspondence, I, 298-9):

Ich habe Freunde in Paris gefunden—Ludwig Uhland. Der Dichter Uhland. Während so Viele gar vortreffliche Gedichte verfertigen von der Art, wie alle sie machen und keiner sie liest, schreibt Dieser welche, wie keiner sie macht und jeder sie liest, ich sage nichts mehr. . . . In der Manuskriptensammlung, die ich hierher mitgenommen habe, sind wahre Meisterstücke. . . .

The Schiller-Museum at Marbach where Uhland's papers are kept sent me the copies which Uhland made in Paris, but the tale of the 'Sold Shadow' is not among them. We may conclude that this particular copy had been among the manuscripts which he gave to Chamisso. I have not been able to trace any correspondence between Chamisso and Uhland that would throw light upon this matter. Only the original document can enable us to judge how the French story was used and transformed by Chamisso.

ELISABETH HAUSMANN

REVIEWS

The Rhythm of Beowulf. By JOHN COLLINS POPE. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. x+386 pp. 30s.

This important study of Old English versification starts from the acceptable premiss that while Sievers's system of five main types of half-line may represent a sound enough deduction from philological data, it is nevertheless, when judged by its effect on the ear, anything but pleasant or even plausible. Sievers himself recognized this weakness, and in 1925 he proposed his tests of 'Schallanalyse' to bring the rhythm of the verse into line with that of music, though this involved in many instances the ignoring of the prose accentuation and the clear evidence of alliteration. No one can in fact be happy over a *C* type in which the second heavy stress may have to fall on a normally unstressed syllable, but even more disconcerting are *B* and *C* types with up to seven preliminary syllables in Old English, and as many as fourteen in Old Saxon. We are driven to conclude either that Germanic verse is 'barbarous', or that some essential principle has been lost through the break in tradition at or before the Norman Conquest. Mr Pope inclines to the latter view, and after a critical review of the theories of Sievers, Leonard and Heusler, he proceeds to elaborate his own. The views of Leonard have generally found little favour in this country even in their revised form, and both the general sacrificing of meaning to rhythm and the effect of 'sing-song' do render his readings unattractive. But he has never ceased to point out the musical weaknesses of Sievers's system, and so has kept the problem *sub judice*. Mr Pope is nearer to Heusler, though he differs from him with regard to extrametrical anacrusis. The new theory takes over from Heusler the idea of rests and proposes as its main feature an initial rest in the *B* and *C* types, so that, for example, the first measure may consist of a rest followed by two normally unstressed words, and the second measure of the two more heavily stressed words. In the *C* type the heavy part is wholly within the second measure. The first measure may, on the other hand, contain a short rest followed by three syllables, or no rest at all, but consist of four or five syllables. This theory undoubtedly brings the *B* and *C* types with their otherwise excessively lengthy introduction into line with the marching rhythms of *A*, *D* and *E* types. It is impossible here in the short space allotted to give even in bare outline the system evolved by Mr Pope, as it depends on the musical notation system, and while simple in itself, is naturally complex in application. The important thing about this study is that it has grown out of reading Old English verse aloud which is surely a better approach than the forcing of the rhythm into a theory based on such things as alliteration and quantity.

One's acceptance or rejection of this new theory will probably rest on subjective considerations; if prolonged reading or intoning of the verse by this method is found satisfying to the ear, the student may well accept it while retaining Sievers's five types as representative not of the rhythm but of the arrangement of the alliteration and heavily stressed syllables. While

basing his theory on the ordinary data available, Mr Pope takes into consideration the use of the harp by the minstrels and is able to show that his initial rest belongs essentially to music rather than to verse as such, a factor which he thinks accounts for the loss of this essential feature in Middle English alliterative verse. Here we do not feel altogether convinced, for is it not remarkable in that case that alliterative poetry survived at all?

The hypermetric verses are skilfully handled and the specimen notations are extensive and varied, while an appendix of a hundred and fifty pages is devoted to a most careful classification of the rhythmic variations in *Beowulf*. This is not a work that can be ignored as another attempt to dethrone Sievers; it is constructive, along the right lines and not unlike the sort of thing Sievers himself attempted in 1925. One could have wished for some practical extension of the theory to Old High German and Old Saxon, but students will be grateful for this book to place alongside the text of *Beowulf*, for to deprive the poem of its musical value is seriously to detract from its abiding worth.

JAMES P. OAKDEN

ST ANDREWS

Hali Meðhad. Edited by A. F. COLBORN. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard; London: Humphrey Milford. 1940. 143 pp. Dan. Kr. 8.

In 1922 Furnivall, re-editing Cockayne's mainly Cotton Titus text of *Hali Meðhad* and printing for the first time that of MS. Bodley 34, called T 'the more correct and less provincial of the two'. Both texts have now been examined afresh, in the light of the recently intensified study of the Katherine Group (Wilson's *Sawles Warde* was presumably not available). This editor concludes that, whatever Furnivall meant, B, though liable to scribal error and occasionally wrong, is the better text.

Scribal lapses apart, the texts are unaltered; in critical footnotes readings previously suggested are adopted (e.g. *swelle* for *swelin*, 517), those passed over or wrongly explained and translated by Furnivall are established (e.g. *an urle*, 319; *hūm*, 715), at least one rejected by him is restored (*uleð*, 20) and three new readings are offered—*leoð*, *ferkūn*, *samplūn* for the mysterious *leo*, *feskin*, *famplūn* of (B) ll. 293, 538 and 553. A few inconsistencies which may be misprints (e.g. *as ðe este*, B 424) mar otherwise good texts.

That the full linguistic study does not yield important new results, far from being a defect, is a highly significant corroboration, from one more work of the Group, of the findings by the latest investigators with regard to the rest. In form, structure and vocabulary the language of B is as consistent as and identical with that of the other texts in the manuscript and so also with that of the *Ancrene Wisse*, presenting the same treatment of weak verbs, the same unusual forms and meanings, words similarly not previously recorded, elsewhere unrecorded, or characteristic of the Group; among such *nurð*, occurring here, in three other Group works, in AW. and in AR., taken by Furnivall and the scribe of T for *mirð*/*murð*, has baffled each editor in turn and still remains unsolved though a new gleam is here cast upon it. Phraseology common to the Group, alliterative habits and Scandinavian parallels are carefully noted. The mainly etymological notes provide much additional evidence and new

light, with conclusions differing at times from those of fellow investigators—of Wilson about *dorc*, for instance, and d'Ardenne about the development of *weorpen*, *weorþ*. *Undonc in his tēð* becomes a study in self-preservation by developing on new if mistaken lines and also a further witness to the homogeneous if not single origin of these works.

It is, however, in these sections that the defects occur: misprints, uncertainty as to indication of quantity, some looseness of statement and expression make the book more difficult and less pleasant to handle than it deserves to be. One might not have at hand the editions of Mack, d'Ardenne or Wilson; that this editor is conscious of the interdependence of his work and theirs probably accounts for but does not justify ineffective lay-out and the absence of a complete bibliography and meanings in addition to an index of forms. But the main value of the book stands—the two texts: the conclusions, relating to them and having a wider reference, in particular to *Ancrene Wisse* whose 'Englishness' and external connexion with Herefordshire it shares. *Hal Meidhad* is the only work of the Group for which there is no known original. We seem to be again tantalizingly close to an unidentifiable centre, individual or communal, of creative as well as scholarly and scribal activity. Misunderstandings in B are few (e.g. *an urle*, 319; *as doþ*, 93); the tabulated non-dialectal variations in T are not numerous but highly significant, especially the omission and substitution of unusual words and phrases (e.g. *cader*, B 537, 553; *reng*, 296; *weorri* for *wori*, 714). Altogether they support the editor's contention that T, though better transcribed, is further removed than B from the original and from the original's dialect. In relation therefore to the original, it is neither 'more correct' nor 'less provincial'. But, advanced though we be on Furnivall, we have probably not yet reached a point when we can assert with the confidence of Einkenel any special area of authorship. D'Ardenne's wary approach and Wilson's refusal to press the localization beyond 'West Midland and possibly Herefordshire' are perhaps safer than Colborn's 'not far removed from Worcestershire'.

HILDA A. C. GREEN

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY

Chaucer's Irregular -E, A Demonstration among Monosyllabic Nouns of the Exceptions to Grammatical and Metrical Harmony. By R. BUCHANAN McJIMSEY. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. x+248 pp. 13s. 6d.

By taking Tatlock and Kennedy's *Concordance* as her primary word source and by strictly limiting her field to substantives of one syllable, Dr McJimsey has been able to complete single-handed a very useful thesis. Her aim has been not to demonstrate Chaucer's regularity in the grammatical and metrical use of *-e* but rather to explore thoroughly every apparent exception. Every monosyllabic noun listed in the *Concordance* has been scrutinized and all evidence of *-e* has been examined in relation to scansion, rhyme, derivation, reputability of the text, and frequency of occurrence. The suspected irregular nouns are then tabulated in an elaborate Demonstration preceded by an inclusive Epitome. The results are very satisfying. They corroborate the conclusions (and surmises) of Child, Kittredge, Manly and Ford. Indeed,

the more detailed and comprehensive the analysis, the more manifest does the native strength of Chaucer's English become. Herein lies the great value of this thesis. Historical phonology, it is true, has not always been fully respected. For example, the statement (p 137) that 'it is more likely that the modern voicing of -v- [in *twelve*] occurred before Chaucer's time than after' is puzzling in view of the fact that this -v- (written -f-) had been voiced continuously in the genitive *twelfa* since the early Old English period. So, too, the antecedents of many Chaucerian words seem to have been culled (at top speed) from J. R. Clark Hall's *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* without regard to phonological descent. Chaucer's *file* derives from *fīl* rather than from *fēol*; *shethe* from *scēaþ* or *scēþ* not from *scæð*; *slouthe* from *slāw* + *þ* not from *slāwð*; *muchel(l)* from *mycel* not from *macel*; and so on. Monosyllabic *Dant* for Dante (from Durante) is surely well attested in Chaucer. Perhaps it is hardly fair to censure misprints in a photolithographed book published 'without the usual editorial attention of Columbia University Press'. But we wish that more misprints had been rectified in the pages assigned to *Corrigenda*. Scant respect is paid to the memory of such eminent scholars as Oliver Farrar Emerson, John Matthews Manly and Wallace M. Lindsay when their very names are distorted.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

George Gascoigne. Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet. By C. T. PROUTY. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xii+351 pp. 25s.

It was time that someone devoted a full-length study to George Gascoigne, and Mr Prouty has placed all Elizabethan scholars in his debt by writing this book. The sources and dramatic value of the plays are fully discussed, but Mr Prouty rightly emphasizes Gascoigne's originality in his attempts at novel-writing; and it is good to know that a complete edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* which will provide a full text of the earlier version of *The Adventures of Master F. J.* is in preparation. The exposition of the fighting in the Netherlands by the English volunteers 1573-6 explains many obscure references in Gascoigne's autobiographical poems.

Gascoigne, an innovator in most things, was conservative in his verse practice. He was avowedly indebted to Piers Plowman in his blank verse satire *The Steel Glas*, and *The Grief of Joye* is written in the alliterative stanzas used throughout the *Mirroure for Magistrates*. It is, by the way, rather fanciful to wonder whether the fourth song of *The Grief of Joye* ends in the middle of a line with the note, 'Left vnperfect for fear of Horsmen', because in the midst of the spoil of Antwerp Gascoigne was calmly composing rhyme royal stanzas as a New Year's present for the Queen. It is surely obvious from the context that Gascoigne means that he left the poem unfinished for fear of giving offence to horsemen. Gascoigne's interest in hunting seems to have escaped Mr Prouty's notice. I have suggested elsewhere (*Modern Language Review*, October 1942) that Gascoigne was the author of *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1575).

Gascoigne's sensational marriage to Elizabeth Breton has excited the interest of several researchers—notably Mr Prouty himself, Miss Ambrose and Mr B. M. Ward. It is convenient to have the various discoveries assimilated in a consecutive story. One small supplementary fact explains why some time after his death John Bacon's children assumed his executorship of William Breton's will: the co-executor, Laurence Eresby, was also dead by 1562 (*Inquisitions Post Mortem*—Chancery Series, II, 4 Elizabeth). Mr Prouty wonders whether Gascoigne cheated his foster-children even in death. Reference to the numerous works of Nicholas Breton would have provided evidence of that writer's habitual poverty. Mr Fitzgerald Flowring discusses this question in an article in the *Review of English Studies* for July 1940: he also mentions an entry, in the *Lincoln Episcopal Records* for 20 February 1566, of a grant by George Gascoigne of property belonging to Richard Breton which would have fitted nicely into the sequence of events deduced from material in the Public Record Office.

One leaves Mr Prouty's book with the conviction that Gascoigne is one of the most attractive of the early Elizabethan literary figures. If he had not scattered his energies in so many different fields he might have produced one really first-rate work, for, as Gabriel Harvey wrote, 'Many others have maintained themselves gallantly upon some one of his qualities'.

JEAN ROBERTSON

LIVERPOOL

Hamlet, the Prince or the Poem? By C. S. LEWIS. Proceedings of the British Academy, Volume xxviii. London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. 18 pp. 1s. 6d.

Perhaps the fairest way to indicate the substance of this lecture is to quote, so far as possible, the writer's own words. This, however, does scant justice to his urbane yet provocative argument.

The criticism of *Hamlet* may be divided roughly

into three main schools or tendencies. The first is that which maintains simply that the actions of Hamlet have not been given adequate motives [particularly for his procrastination] and that the play is so far bad... The second school... thinks that he did not delay at all but went to work as quickly as the circumstances permitted... In the third school or group I include all those critics who admit that Hamlet procrastinates and who explain the procrastination by his psychology.

The error of the critics

was to put the mystery in the wrong place—in Hamlet's motives rather than in that darkness which enwraps Hamlet and the whole tragedy and all who read or watch it.

Mr Eliot has maintained that the play 'is most certainly an artistic failure'. But

we cannot escape from our problem by pronouncing the play bad... The only solution which occurs to me is that the critics' delight in the play is not in fact due to the delineation of Hamlet's character but to something else.

In considering a Shakespeare play the first thing

is to surrender oneself to the poetry and the situation. It is only through them that you can reach the characters, and it is for their sake that the characters exist.... A good example

of the kind of play which can be twisted out of recognition by character criticism is the *Merchant of Venice*. . . . If I wanted to make one more addition to the gallery of Hamlet's portraits I should trace his hesitation to the fear of death; not to a physical fear of dying, but a fear of being dead. . . . I believe that we read Hamlet's speeches with interest chiefly because they describe so well a certain spiritual region through which most of us have passed and anyone in his circumstances might be expected to pass, rather than because of our concern to understand how and why this particular man entered it. . . .

The true hero of the play

is man—haunted man—man with his mind on the frontier of two worlds, man unable either quite to reject or quite to admit the supernatural, man struggling to get something done as man has struggled from the beginning, yet incapable of achievement because of his inability to understand either himself or his fellows or the real quality of the universe which has produced him.

We may certainly reject the view that *Hamlet* is an artistic failure. Perhaps Mr Eliot has altered his opinion in the last twenty years. We may further agree, of course, that haunting fear of the hereafter and perplexity as to man's relation to the universe intensify greatly the imaginative effect of the play. But these elements must not blind us to the fact that *Hamlet* is a poetic drama, and not, as the title of the lecture suggests, a dramatic poem. Much in it is only comprehensible as intended for theatrical effect. Imagery is significant, but it must occupy a secondary place. When Mr Lewis tells us, by way of illustration, that the *Merchant of Venice* 'is not so much about men as about metals', we may be forgiven for raising our eyebrows. And when he says that the true hero of *Hamlet* is not the Danish prince, but 'man', some of us might reply that we believe that the play was written, not to set forth any abstract or philosophic concept, but to portray a moving struggle affecting certain definite human beings. Their motives are sometimes difficult to analyse satisfactorily, just as are those of people in everyday life, but we ought surely to strive to the best of our ability to divine Shakespeare's own conception of their motives. Mr Lewis has, however, little patience with character analysis. He believes, apparently, that because much of it has been bad and misleading—which no one will deny—we ought to have little to do with it, but rather to enwrap ourselves in the darkness and mystery of Elsinore. So with 'historical criticism'; it is obvious that appreciation of *Hamlet* has often gone badly astray when not guided by knowledge of contemporary conditions and of the antecedents of the play. 'The kind of criticism which I have attempted', says the lecturer, 'is always at a disadvantage against either historical criticism or character criticism. . . . But the things I want to talk about have no vocabulary and criticism has for centuries kept almost complete silence on them.' Such new light as may be thrown on *Hamlet* will be very cordially welcomed. But is the method which Mr Lewis follows very novel? The subjective and impressionistic approach, the search for a revealing philosophical formula, the emphasis on poetic rather than dramatic values—all this has been with us for a long time. Nearly forty years ago A. C. Bradley stressed the importance of atmosphere and imagery in Shakespearean tragedy, particularly *Macbeth*.

Decision in regard to these matters amounts, of course, to a credo of *Hamlet* criticism. As to that, each of us must work according to the faith that is in him. Whether or not Mr Lewis's essay carries conviction, it performs a service

in putting some fundamental questions squarely before the reader, and in recording the conclusions of a sensitive interpreter.

WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE

NEW YORK

The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible. By CHARLES C. BUTTERWORTH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. xii+387 pp. 21s. 6d.

This book shows how translators of the English Bible had their achievements prior to the Authorised Version. Confining himself to the period 1340-1611, the author has carefully scrutinized and collated the available renderings of the Bible or portions of it that had appeared in English, and provided them with short historical introductions. The main thesis of the study is to indicate how each new translation had a dependence upon its antecedents, and he has taken pains to prove this in detail, showing how a particular rendering varied from a preceding version, by way of correction or taste. It is surprising to find that in the body of the book as many as fifty-eight such renderings are treated, all emanating from the period 1340-1611, and a convenient table on pp. 250-2 gives their names and the dates or approximate dates of their first appearance.

A starting point is made with some pre-Wycliffite translations, but the author soon goes on to discuss the importance of Wycliffe and his Bibles. Step by step he labours through the subsequent years, outlining six versions in the fourteenth century, three unimportant sections during the whole of the fifteenth century, forty-six during the sixteenth, and three in the seventeenth before 1611. Most of them are known to the student of this period, yet the treatment of each is informative and fresh. Twelve pages in all, for instance, are devoted to George Joye, who, between 1534 and 1540, produced translations of Isaiah, Jeremiah and the Psalter, and their respective relationships with the Bibles of Tyndale and of Coverdale, showing, incidentally, that it is Joye who should be fathered with the rendering 'bugs' in Psalm 91, 5, for this is generally attributed to the Coverdale Bibles. A version which is not well known, and which is dealt with here, the author claims, for the first time, is the 'Godfrey edition of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes'. He dates this later than the usually accepted year 1532, making it 1535(?).

The author states that 'it was only natural that the translators of the first English Bible should seek to make their version correspond as closely as possible to the Latin text which was the basis of their work' (p. 42). But what is not clear is how or when a subsequent turning to the original Hebrew and Greek texts took place. This is a weakness in the book. The writer seems to be too interested in the 'direct lineage', if I may borrow his metaphor, and the result is to doubt the value of the King James Bible even as an attempted translation of the Hebrew and Greek Bible. True, there are discussions about the scholarship of some, e.g. the Bishops' Bible, but even this seems to aggravate its absence in the case of others. Perhaps, after all, the author himself is not really interested in this approach, for there is a rather suspicious reference on p. 75, viz. that the book of Lamentations in Hebrew was in the form of 'an alphabetical acrostic, similar to that used in the 119th Psalm'.

This Psalm is certainly acrostic, but that of Lamentations corresponds much more to that of Psalm 25 than of Psalm 119.

Nevertheless, this should not detract unduly from a satisfactory piece of scholarship, presented in a very readable manner, useful as a reference book, and, especially for war-time, published in a pleasing volume.

B. J. ROBERTS

ABERYSTWYTH

A Preface to Paradise Lost. Being the Ballard Matthews Lectures Delivered at University College, North Wales, 1941, Revised and Enlarged. By C. S. LEWIS. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1942. vii + 139 pp. 7s. 6d.

This is an admirable introduction to the study and reconsideration of *Paradise Lost* and one which only Mr Lewis could have written. The tide has flowed so strongly of late against at least the two epics of Milton that it was time a bold and well-informed defence was forthcoming of poems the greatness of which in some respects was felt by many even of those who condemned them. Mr Pearsall Smith's recent *Milton and His Critics* was too purely aesthetic and stylistic. Mr Lewis has gone about the task in a bolder but the only really possible way by inviting us to see the poem again from Milton's own point of view, as a poem of a definite type, the Renaissance Epic, composed with a quite definite purpose, as definite as Virgil's in the *Aeneid*, viz. to justify the ways of God to men. Mr Lewis, like many others, alters this to the 'ways of God to Man', thereby incorporating Pope's 'to vindicate the ways of God to Man'. The fact is I never feel quite sure that 'to men' ought not to go with 'justify', 'to justify to men the ways of God', for the ways of God to Satan and his angels come also under consideration.

Two things have contributed to the disfavour into which Milton's poems have fallen, for it is not quite a recent phenomenon. The late Professor Conway, an enthusiastic Virgilian, said to me, 'I never read Milton now'. One is the difficulty for many of accepting as history the first half of Paul's 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive'. The other has been the tendency to read the poems through our knowledge of Milton's life and his fierce political pamphlets, to suspect, quite unjustly if one take, as Mr Lewis does (c. XIII, Satan), the whole treatment of the character into view, an at least half-conscious sympathy with his hero on the wrong side. To Vondel, the Catholic poet of Holland, Cromwell and his fellows *did* seem to be the exact counterparts on earth of Lucifer, Beelzebub and their train. To Vondel's sense of Hierarchy (Mr Lewis' central theme, see XI, pp. 72-80) the execution of Mary of Scotland by Elizabeth, and of Charles by Cromwell, were actions of the same kind as Satan's rebellion in Heaven. Not so to Milton. Mr Lewis a little evades this issue by dragging in poor Charles II (p. 75), but of this later.

Mr Lewis is the right person to recall us to the study of *Paradise Lost* as Milton intended it to be read, and as it was read for a century and more even by a critic like Dr Johnson who disliked the personality and politics of Milton as heartily as Mr Belloc. He is the right person because, as he tells us (p. 64; it was hardly necessary), a Christian, an orthodox Christian prepared, with

Milton and Dr Johnson, to accept as an historical fact, if not Adam and not in 4004 B.C., some Paradisal Man whose rebellion against God

Brought death into the world, and all our woe
With loss of Eden, till one greater man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat.

The opening chapters on the Epic might be read with Mr Tillyard's two papers on the English Epic Tradition. Besides the diffuse and the brief epic, e.g. the *Aeneid* and the *Book of Job*, Milton distinguishes the classical epic, 'keeping the rules of Aristotle', and that in which the poet follows 'Nature... which to them who know art and use judgement is no transgression but an enrichment of art'. By the latter Mr Lewis and (I think) Mr Tillyard take for granted that Milton meant the epic as represented by the romantic poems of Boiardo, Ariosto and Spenser. He is perhaps thinking primarily of these, but his words and thought have a wider range and would include any narrative poem which justified itself as a work of art and had the 'solemnity' in theme, purpose and diction of the epic tradition. For when Milton at this date speaks of nature in the poet he has a quite definite example in his mind, namely, William Shakespeare:

Or sweetest Shakespeare, fancy's child
Warble his native woodnotes wild

and earlier:

For while to the shame of slow-endeavouring art
Thy easy numbers flow.

Here was a poet who did not follow the rules of Aristotle and yet had produced an enrichment of art

In discussing the epic Mr Lewis draws the real and helpful distinction between primary and secondary epic, epic such as we hear of in *Homer* and in *Beowulf*, of which these poems are either examples or developments, and secondary epic of which Virgil was the creator, epic which has for its theme, like primary, a moving, heroic, tragic action accepted as historical but an event also on which great issues hang, in composing which the poet looks before and after. The chapter on the subject of secondary epic is to me one of the most interesting in the volume. The *Aeneid*, like, on a lower artistic scale, the *Bruce*, is a great national poem, as the *Iliad* is not: 'The Trojan war is not the subject of the *Iliad*. It is merely the background to a purely personal story—that of Achilles' wrath, suffering, repentance, and killing of Hector.' That seems to me just, though I would add the great scene where Achilles and Priam weep together in which one feels to the full the tragic sense of life which Mr Lewis justly says underlies the *Iliad*. But I cannot follow him in his statement that the poem is not entirely Greek in its sympathies. One has but to recall one's earliest feelings of disappointment, even indignation, at the unfair treatment of the Trojans. Even when the gods give them an hour of victory all the honours of single combat go to the Greeks. It is only when their wounded heroes are led from the field that the Trojans seem to be on the verge of victory—and then Achilles emerges! If Hector is the noblest or most attractive character it is much as Satan is so to Godwin, Shelley and others—by accident. It was not the poet's intention. Hector has no rival in Troy (except it be for a moment Sarpedon), and it was necessary to have some

balance of interest. The heroes of the *Iliad* are Achilles, Ajax and Odysseus, as the Hero of *Paradise Lost* is the Son of God.

In all that Mr Lewis has to say on the ritual, hieratic style of epic, and of the style of *Paradise Lost*, I am in entire agreement with him. (His discussion with Mr Richards and others in his eighth section, *Defence of this Style*, I leave alone, for I have never understood Mr Richards.) He has illustrated admirably the grand onward march of Milton's style, his syntax and verse, the effect of the sense 'variously drawn out from one verse to another'. In distinguishing between rhetoric and poetry he refers rather scornfully to Mill's 'poetry is overheard'. But the distinction is older than Mill. It is well stated by Keble in his *De Poeticae Vi Medica*. There Keble cites the great paragraph of Burke on the Queen of France and comments: 'Haec si quis omni laude majora, si vere magnifica ac splendida dixerit, audio sane, vehementerque comprobo; sin *Poetica* non prorsus concedo; nam nescio quid *Rhetoricum* sapere videntur, et ad aures hominum studiosius accommodari.' He then takes a passage from Jeremy Taylor and goes on: 'Ecquid ista neget pleno de pectore manare? Ecquis dubitet eum, qui ita locutus sit, tantum quoque, et solitarium, tale aliquid secum locuturum?' The difference is, of course, really that the orator addressing an audience, a mixed audience, with a practical intent, is more concerned to stir up their emotions than to give exact, perhaps even sincere, expression to his own. The poet has only one desire, to express, that is, to communicate his own emotion. He does not speak only to himself of course (no one suffers more from want of sympathy than a poet like Shelley), but he does speak only to those who have ears to hear. He desires and needs perfect understanding and sympathy. To read a poem, one's own or another's, to someone and find it produces no response is like being stung by a jelly-fish.

There are only two points in the discussion of Milton's subject, his justification, which I should like to touch on—the idea of hierarchy (c. xi) and his Arianism. Whatever democratic leanings Milton had (probably but few) while his hopes centred in the English people, by the time he came to write *Paradise Lost* he was as convinced an advocate of hierarchy as Plato in the *Laws*. 'Nothing is more agreeable to the order of nature or more for the interest of mankind, than that the less should yield to the greater, not in numbers but in wisdom and virtue.' This includes the rule of the wife by her husband, and Mr Lewis, who points out (as Schücking had done) that this is included in Shakespeare's conception of 'degree', touches on *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Macbeth* (the wife's domination over the husband is a 'monstrous regiment'). I wish he had mentioned *Othello*. Does he, with Saintsbury and Schücking, consider Desdemona's fate as the penalty of her *hamartia* in disobeying her father? I suppose so; and that the feeling that there is something noble in her fine recklessness is one more delusion of these unhappy romantics.

In considering Milton's regard for hierarchy as shown in his own life and political pamphlets Mr Lewis seems to me to evade the true difficulty by dragging in Charles II (p. 75): 'We must first inquire whether Charles II is or is not our natural superior.' Well, to adapt a phrase of Dryden, morally it is difficult to sink as low as Charles II. But what of Charles I, Milton's legitimate sovereign and, even in the opinion of the self-righteous Mrs Hutchinson, a good

man' Was it consistent with a due sense of hierarchy to rebel and slay (and defend the slaying of) Charles I? Shakespeare would not have agreed with Milton in that:

O forfend it God
That in a Christian climate souls refined
Should show so heinous, black, obscene a deed!

The difficulty about this doctrine of the duty of finding one's natural superior is that it leaves so much to the individual's choice. Milton found his first in the King, 'a truly Christian monarchy', if Charles will reform the Church; then in the Parliament; then in Cromwell provided again that Cromwell will act as he approves in the matter of the tithes; then in Parliament again and Cromwell's rule is described as 'a short and scandalous night of usurpation'; finally in God, the will of God as understood by John Milton, which will yet assert itself.

But Milton man and politician is one thing, his deliberately conceived poem is another. Undoubtedly the central idea of that is hierarchy, obedience. The sin of Eve and Adam is disobedience, 'aspiring above their order'. To God as their creator and sovereign (there is no republicanism in Heaven) Satan and Adam owe one duty—implicit obedience. Satan's sin is the greater because it has its source in his own heart.

The first sort by their own suggestion fell,
Self-tempted, self-depraved; Man falls deceived
By the other first: Man therefore shall find grace,
The other none.

It is all quite just. God is creator and sovereign. Some of the contemporaries of Milton felt just so about their legitimate sovereign and for that laid down their lives. Yet for a poem, to affect the imagination, one would fain have something more. Obedience becomes beautiful when it is inspired by love, disobedience viler when it is the betrayal of trust. Milton's poem is full of the despotism of God, not sufficiently of the fatherhood of God. It is doubtless suggested both in the interchange of resolves between the Father and Son in Book III, and in the speech of Abdiel where, laying down the doctrine of God's sovereignty, he yet adds:

Yet by experience taught we know how good,
And of our good, and of our dignity
How provident he is

But that feeling does not sufficiently pervade the poem to affect us as it might. It is not the only instance in which the difference between a doctrine as Milton defines it and as he brings it home to our heart and imagination is striking.

There remains the question of Milton's Arianism. Mr Lewis, following to some extent Mr Sewell, declares that there is nothing of this discoverable in the poem. This is true; but it is also true that there is nothing incompatible with the Arianism which he develops in the longest, and one of the most passionate, sections in his *De Doctrina*. What he does in the crucial passage v, 572 ff.

This day have I begot, etc.

is, as Bishop Newton notes, to 'confine himself to the phrases and expressions of Scripture; and in this particular speech the reader will easily remark how

much of it is copied from Holy Writ by comparing it with the following texts', and he goes on to quote Psalm ii, 6, 7; Genesis xxii, 16; and Philippians ii, 10, 11. How he himself interprets the word 'beget' the Bishop does not say, nor again when he comes to the difficult (if one takes it to mean create, bring into being), Abdiel's

him, begotten son; by whom
As by his word the mighty Father made
All things, even thee.

Newton is content to quote Colossians i, 16, 17. In Abdiel's words 'beget' does mean 'bring into being', for when all things were made the formal exaltation had not taken place. But it is not quite fair to ask some questions of a poet who is determined to adhere to the text of the Bible whether he comprehends its whole implication or not. But throughout the Messiah, as he is also called, is the Son as in the Synoptic Gospels. There is no indication that he is the equal of the Father. One must not forget, despite his reverence for the Fathers and St Augustine, Milton's early and repeated assertion that for him the Bible and the Bible only was his final court of appeal. His appeal is to the same source in the poem and in the *De Doctrina*. In the former he is not too anxious to proclaim his heresy, so he confines himself to the words of Scripture, leaving the reader to interpret for himself. In the prose treatise in Latin ('John Milton to all the Churches') he makes the same appeal to Scripture, amassing texts to prove that Christ never made claim to be the equal of the Father in power or in knowledge.

This is a very inadequate review of Mr Lewis's work which is full of good things and of others I should like to discuss. Regarding Milton, as regarding Spenser, where I find myself differing from Mr Lewis is that to my mind there is often a great difference between the declared intention of a poet and the final effect which his work has upon the imagination of the reader: 'For all good poets, epic as well as lyric, compose their beautiful poems not as works of art, but because they are inspired and possessed. . . For the poet is a light-winged and holy thing, and there is no invention in him until he has been inspired and is out of his senses and the mind is no longer in him.' In other words, in the poet's state of mind when he creates, the truth of what he feels soaks in, and it is not always what he thought he felt or what he wished to feel. Even Mr Lewis is a little shocked when the 'eternal eye . . . saw rebellion arising and . . . smiling to his only Son thus said'. Theologically and logically it is quite correct, for the Father, seeing into Satan's mind, as no angel could, is aware of his obduracy. But the Catholic Dutch poet is more Christian in feeling when he represents the countenance of the Deity, on the first tidings of rebellion, as veiled with a cloud of sorrow. Raphael is sent down not to amuse Adam, but to plead with Lucifer. It is only when the rising cloud of incense indicates that Lucifer is accepting the worship due to God that his doom is sealed.

Mr Lewis's acceptance of Milton's orthodoxy ('the poem is overwhelmingly Christian'), as everything he writes, is interesting and significant. If the Romantic Revival is dead and the Liberal faith in progress, so is Liberal Christianity with its vague hopes for humanity. If we are to be Christian we must revert to the orthodox, historical position: 'strait is the gate and narrow

is the way and few there be that find it'; 'Many are called but few are chosen'; 'I pray not for the world.' The lapse of centuries may make the few many, but *not* in comparison. That was the end of Milton's hopes:

so shall the world go on,
To good malignant, to bad men benign,
Under her own weight groaning, till the day
Appear of restoration to the just,
And vengeance to the wicked.

An orthodox conclusion, yet a little melancholy if one recall the enthusiasm with which he had anticipated a better world and the possibility of the Second Coming. 'For the voice of the Bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed' (1641). Mr Lewis has written an interesting and valuable *apologia* for Milton from a strictly orthodox point of view. The question of sex in the state of innocence as imagined by theologians is beyond me. The matter seems not to have troubled Milton because he saw nothing in sex to be ashamed of but abandonment to sensual excess. On the whole the summing up by Mr Tillyard in the Epilogue to his *Milton* is to me more satisfactory as indicating the interest of Milton's thought even to those who may not share his Pauline, Augustinian, yet semi-Pelagian theology.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

EDINBURGH

A Bibliography of British History, 1700-1715. By WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN and CHLOE SINGER MORGAN. Vol. iv, 1941, viii+381 pp; vol. v, 1942, xiv+487 pp. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana.

This great work is now complete. All who are interested in the history of Britain during the eighteenth century have good cause to feel grateful alike to the compilers and to those learned institutions which have made grants towards the cost of its publication. Such works cannot, unhappily, command a large sale, and without financial aid they could not appear.

Volume iv contains information about manuscript sources for the period in the chief archives of Britain and also of many Continental countries. Such information has never before been assembled, and its amount and variety will come as a surprise to most students of the period. English historians have made some use of French archives; the Dutch archives have seldom been consulted by them, since Macaulay drew attention to their value, the resources of Berlin, Vienna, and other Continental repositories have been grossly neglected. It is perhaps too much to expect every student of the period to emulate the diligence of Professor and Mrs Morgan; but it is all to the good that attention should be drawn to the wealth of materials available. Granted that nobody can read everything, it is important that selection should be made on the basis of some definite knowledge, and this is now easy.

Volume v contains supplements to volumes I-III and a copious index to the whole work.

Now that this bibliography is complete, some estimate of its value as a whole can be formed, though a full appreciation will not be possible until it has been in general use for a number of years. Errors and omissions certainly exist. The list of contemporary publications is not, and could not be, complete.

But that is a minor matter. The important thing is that it is sufficiently full to be an admirable guide to the student of a period upon which so little thorough bibliographical work has yet been done. Hitherto adequate use has not, with a few exceptions, been made of contemporary printed sources. Hence it is one of the outstanding merits of this bibliography that it recognizes the importance of these sources and aims at helping the researcher to use them together with the unpublished sources and the relevant modern works. To point out the value of such a bibliography to those interested in the period 1700-15 is superfluous; but it is worth stressing the point that any young researcher who is beginning to work on the late seventeenth century, or any part of the eighteenth, will gain much knowledge and enlightenment, if at an early stage in his studies he spends a few hours examining this great work; he will thereby gain some idea of the types of material that exist; for these remained fairly constant between 1689 and 1800 or so.

This bibliography is intended alike for students of history and of literature, as any true bibliography of such a kind must be. For both use the same sort of material, though sometimes for different purposes. That fact is often ignored with unfortunate results. If this bibliography helps to make the schools of history and of literature realize how much they have in common, its service to learning will be all the greater and so, too, the reviewer hopes, will the gratitude of its users to Professor and Mrs Morgan, and to the University of Indiana.

MARK A. THOMSON

LONDON

The Poems of Samuel Johnson. Edited by DAVID NICHOL SMITH and EDWARD L. McADAM. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1941. xxvi+420 pp. 25s.

I. This edition of Johnson's poems can be counted on to surprise most of us by the Johnsonian portliness of its size. Not very long ago Johnson was esteemed mainly as the figure dominating the cinematograph show of Boswell; he is still in process of becoming properly esteemed on his own account as a prose writer; and he is only now on the eve of becoming properly esteemed on his own account as a poet. In 1892 G. Birkbeck Hill feared that his meditated edition of Johnson's poems would sell very poorly (see the Introduction to the edition under review, p. xxii). The edition of *London* and of the *Vanity of Human Wishes* which T. S. Eliot memorably introduced in 1930 was an edition limited to 450 copies. And now, before the conservative body of English scholars has become thoroughly accustomed to the active knowledge that the poetry of Johnson is both substantial and splendid, arrives this august addition to the *Oxford English Texts*, an addition which will oblige any one professing to discuss eighteenth-century poetry to pay attention to Johnson's. And not only will the critic be roused to welcome it: the strong band of prose-preferring Johnsonians, who need no rousing, will now see the beloved personality, even the beloved biography, in a new way:

The arrangement [of the poems] is new. As in previous editions the first place is given to *London* and *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, and the four prologues follow in a group; but the minor poems are arranged chronologically, by date of composition generally, and occasionally by date of publication. The old mechanical division between the English poems

and the Latin or Greek poems has been abandoned. Latin was so much a living language to Johnson, so much a natural medium of expression in certain moods, that to treat his poems in that language as a mere exercise in ingenuity is to mistake their purpose and ignore their intimacy. When the English and Latin poems are read together in the order in which they were written, they provide a picture of his mind as vivid as any that he left in prose.

I quote from the concluding section of the Introduction, which also sets out the historical position of the editors, their methods, and their aims.

[the] editor of Johnson's poems to-day enters on a field which has never been properly worked, and he has to work it all anew. He need not be under any obligation to previous editors except in so far as they printed their texts from manuscripts now lost.

In addition to the translation of the mottoes in *The Rambler*, the present edition contains more than twenty pieces which have not hitherto been included in any collection of Johnson's poems, and several of them—notably the early poem 'On St Simon and St Jude'—are printed for the first time....

Johnson's manuscripts have been followed whenever they were available, and likewise all published texts that he is known to have revised....

The introductory notes state what is known about the occasion and composition of the poems, and explain the relation of the different versions. Together they form a collection of all the main facts in Johnson's career as a poet. They also deal with the problems of authorship. Sixteen pieces of which the authorship is doubtful, though most of them are probably not by Johnson, are printed together as an appendix; and another appendix gives a list of twenty-four pieces which at one time or another have been ascribed to him wrongly or with no good reason.

The labour accordingly has been great; and it has been all the greater because it has been undertaken at a propitious time: the preface expresses the satisfaction of the senior editor that the edition which he projected in 1913 was accidentally postponed:

The delay cannot be regretted, for during these years more additions have been made to our information about Johnson than at any time since the publication of Boswell's *Life*. Manuscripts which were not suspected to exist have become public or accessible by passing to new owners; and in this process much has been learned about the poems, and their number has been increased.

The result of those thirty years of simmering interest, and of the contributions which the younger American scholar was able to make in the last ten (?) of them, is a volume honeycombed with exquisite learning. Each page is ripe after its prolonged autumn, and though everything is cool and concise, we guess the thousand excitements that have been discreetly subdued.

II. It goes without saying that the poems have been excellently introduced; and excellently annotated—is not the senior editor acknowledged to be that twentieth-century annotator who has given most thought to the proprieties of his science? There are times when each of us prefers to feed on the salted almonds of annotations rather than on the square meal of which they form a part; and some of us find note-tasting (as well as note-taking) a habit which needs constantly to be checked: the taster may become the addict. Both tasters and addicts, however, can be promised a happy time among the notes to this volume and among the introductions which are as concise as the notes themselves. The glowing beef of Johnson is surrounded with subsidiary dishes crisp and choice.

If the present reviewer would like to have seen the text annotated more fully, that is because he asks of the annotator of poems something different from what the editors have set themselves to give. He asks for certain additional things, and asks for them because he sees new poems as rooted in older

poetry. All poets, irrespective of their strikingness, are original poets. They are original because, being individuals, they cannot escape being so: Shakespeare is original, and so is Broome! But their originality consists not only in what they have created which is wholly new (as when, for example, the young Wordsworth called the daffodil 'lofty'): it consists also in what they have borrowed from other people and have combined with what is purely their own. Moreover, even in the most completely original poets, the element which is purely their own, when compared with the element which has been assimilated, is almost always found to be less in amount. Johnson himself believed something of the kind, and went so far as to say that 'poets . . . borrow every thing from their predecessors, and commonly derive very little from nature or from life' (Life of Dryden, *Lives of the Poets*, edited G. Birkbeck Hill, I, 430). When, therefore, the present writer reads a poet alongside his annotator, he wishes to be given the means for grasping just what of other men remains in the new poet; what (in a weak poet or in a strong poet at his least strong) lingers on feebly, or what (in a strong poet or perhaps in a weak poet at his least weak) survives with a new and perhaps increased vitality. When these survivals are recognized to be survivals by the poet himself and when they are presented by him as survivals, the reader will require to know that this is so or he will fail to understand the poet's meaning, or fail to understand at least that part of his meaning which is its tone. But when the survivals are not recognized by the poet for what they are, it is still important that the reader, who plays critic to the poet, should so recognize them. Certain survivals from Oldham in Johnson's *London* are here described as 'similarities suggest[ing] unconscious recollection' (p. 3). But since the poems derive from the poet's head, it is as well to know as far as possible what, having gone into that head, was now coming out of it, even though that head, centred on the problem of the moment, was not actively aware of the life history of all its contents. The present editors do cite survivals from earlier poetry when those survivals reach a certain level of strikingness or where they explicitly test the editors with a stand-and-deliver: against *The Vanity of Human Wishes*, l. 31:

When statutes glean the refuse of the sword,

we are grateful to be given Addison's

Refuse of swords, and gleanings of a fight;

against l. 146:

And pour on misty Doubt resistless day,

it is essential to be given, as we are given, Pope's

Truth breaks upon us with resistless day;

and when in the *Prologue to 'A Word to the Wise'* Johnson's italic signifies that he is making a quotation—

For English vengeance *was not with the dead*

—that quotation is quietly traced to Pope's *Iliad*. But the organ of Johnson's poetry habitually speaks phrases which first roared through other pipes; and because the present edition does not show that it was so, the effect of it is that Johnson seems a more completely original poet than he is.

III. The method of annotating prompts other questions. We are told (p. 45) that Scott 'concludes the farewell note at the end of *Castle Dangerous*' with l. 308 of the *Vanity of Human Wishes*:

Superfluous lags the vet'ran on the stage

(which, by the way, surely owes something to Pope, *Imit. of Hor.* Ep. II, ii, 324 f.). This means that the editors do not rigidly bar from their notes material which, strictly considered, fastens a later author to Johnson rather than fastens Johnson to a former one. But on this principle we have a right to expect honours for more than Scott. The finest tribute to the *Vanity of Human Wishes* is surely Matthew Arnold's who in his third Homer lecture considered that 'Every one will at once remember a thousand passages in which both the ten-syllable couplet and blank verse prove themselves to have nobleness.' His instance of noble blank verse is the opening two lines of Book II of *Paradise Lost*; that of noble heroic couplets

Still raise for good the supplicating voice,
But leave to Heaven the measure and the choice,

which are lines 351-2 of the *Vanity of Human Wishes*. The lines are again described as noble by Cardinal Newman, who quotes them in an address on the conversion of England spoken at a meeting of the Catholic Union in 1880 (see *Sayings of Cardinal Newman*, n.d., p. 65). And T. S. Eliot, in Johnsonian style, has asked where poetry is to be found if it is not to be found in Johnson's character of Charles XII. The value of such remarks depends on who makes them. *The Waste Land* is as acceptable a passport to an annotation as *Castle Dangerous*.

IV. I append a few unrelated comments:

(1) At p. 21 we are told what Johnson meant by bramble. We should like a cross-reference when we meet a bramble again on p. 133:

Soon fades the rose; once past the fragrant hour,
The loiterer finds a bramble for a flow'r.

(Under *bramble*, by the way, the *O.E.D.* quotes an almost parallel run of words from Johnson's *Life of Dryden*: 'The roses had not yet been plucked from the bramble'.)

(2) The word *improve* (*The Vanity of Human Wishes*, l. 281): 'The watchful guests... Improve his heady rage' is glossed as 'increase, augment'. Does it not rather mean 'improve the quality of', 'sharpen', 'intensify': cf. Pope, *Moral Essays*, iv, 111-12:

... a Lake behind
Improves the keenness of the Northern wind.

(3) In the nicely weighed introduction to *Irene*—it is interesting to compare it with the senior editor's earlier draft in the 1929 volume of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*—a comment of Johnson's on *As you like it* is used to fix the contrast that 'Johnson never hastened in his *Irene*'. But the contrast, when fixed, is fixed beside the point: the two plays belong to incomparable kinds. The prime difficulty for anyone writing a play of the classical kind is not to refrain from hastening but to refrain

from dawdling. Shakespeare could hasten because his play was ample already, but if Johnson had hastened his play would have ended up too short.

(4) At *Irene*, I, iv, 20, Johnson writes:

From Solitude to Crouds, from Crouds to Solitude,

and the note (wrongly affixed to I, v, 20) reads: 'The only line of twelve syllables in the play.' The terminology is misleading. We count feet not syllables in English verse and there are five feet not six in this line, the last one ('to solitude') having one hypermetric weak syllable in addition to that which is the characteristic mark of eighteenth-century tragic verse. We read the line something like

x / | x / | x / | x / | x / x x

as we read Hamlet's line in texts deriving from the folio:

What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba.

The discussion in Abbott's *Shakespearean Grammar*, §§ 467 and 494 is relevant.

(5) One of the appendixes is entitled 'Poems wrongly attributed to Johnson', but in the passage already quoted from the Introduction this appendix is described as 'a list of twenty-four pieces which at one time or another have been ascribed to him wrongly or with no good reason'. If any of these pieces are wrongly ascribed to Johnson, they are not by him; but those which are ascribed to him without good reason will turn out to be his if and when a good reason is found.

(6) I have casually noted one or two discrepancies among the references in the notes to *Irene* and in the index (William Collins is mentioned at p. xii, not at p. viii, and the item *Court Miscellany* is placed between the items *Crashaw* and *Crawford*).

(7) One of the novelties of this edition is the chance it gives us to compare the draft of *Irene* (never before published) with the final text. The editors make cross-references from the draft to the final text by means of act-scene-line numerals, but the reader who turns up the final text is handicapped through a lack of numerals in the running title. I have found it worth while inking them in for myself.

(8) Among the notes come frequent references to Johnson's dictionary and they form, of course, a body of most instructive Johnsonian minutiae. But what is the principle of reference? Are we to take it that they include all the references which are of any interest? The editors have taken such pains that I can well believe it; but I should like to be told for certain.

(9) When Johnson breaks out into the comic extempore beginning

Wear the gown, and wear the hat,

may we not say with fair certainty that he is parodying the passage from Gray's *Bard* which we know that he despised?

(10) One fish has escaped the net. In the *Life of Pope* (*Lives of the Poets*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill, III, 231) Johnson, needing an instance to prove a point, invents one rather than take the trouble to hunt for one. That instance should find its place in this collection:

One of the most successful attempts [to embody 'motion' in words] has been to describe the labour of Sisyphus:

'With many a weary step, and many a groan,
Up a [the] high hill he heaves a huge round stone;
The huge round stone, resulting with a bound,
Thunders impetuous down, and smoaks along the ground.'

[Pope's *Odyssey*, xi, 735ff. Johnson echoes the last four words on p. 76 of this edition: cf. also p. 78.] Who does not perceive the stone to move slowly upward, and roll violently back? But set the same numbers to another sense:

'While many a merry tale, and many a song,
Chear'd the rough road, we wish'd the rough road long.
The rough road then, returning in a round,
Mock'd our impatient steps, for all was fairy ground.'

We have now surely lost much of the delay, and much of the rapidity

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

LONDON

The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Bronte. Edited from the Manuscripts by C. W. HATFIELD. New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xxi + 262 pp 18s. 6d.

The editor of this volume gives the fullest possible account of the various MSS. of Emily Jane Brontë's poems and by ingenious arrangement has made it possible to follow the grouping in the MS. while at the same time arranging the poems in chronological order. There is a short but fascinating note on Emily's orthography, and Miss Ratchford, the authoress of *The Brontës' Web of Childhood*, has suggested an arrangement of the poems about the imaginary country of Gondal which yields a more or less coherent story. Mr Hatfield's careful editorial work brings the reader into wonderfully close touch with the actual composition of the poems. The new readings from *Gondal Poems* edited by Helen Brown and Joan Mott are given here, and the poems which were first published there or in the *Brontë Society Publications* are collected; there are also a few brief scraps which have not been printed before. The whole forms a moderate-sized volume; Emily Jane Brontë's writings have the attraction of compactness.

She was a poet for poetry's sake alone. She did not write for fame or money or to convey a message. She cared nothing about an audience; even her one confidant, her sister Anne, did not always see her poems (p. 234: '[Emily] is writing some poetry too. I wonder what it is about?' Anne Brontë, 31 July 1845). Although she wrote in one sense in complete isolation, she was much influenced by the romantic poets. Her imitations of Scott and Byron are many and obvious. The traces of Wordsworth and Coleridge are less noticeable just because she had more affinity with them and therefore assimilated more completely what they had to give her. It is impossible that she should have known anything of William Blake, yet one of her poems (no. 181) might be an echo from him. The resemblance must come from their like experiences. Emily Brontë was a natural mystic. The visions of her childhood are faintly indicated in some tentative early lines (no. 44, 1838).

She began to write poetry in her eighteenth year, and naturally could not satisfy herself (nos. 27 and 38), but a fragment of two verses (no. 23) gives a

theme which recurs in varied forms in her later poems. Finding that she could not express her visionary sense directly, she began to approach it indirectly in poems about the imaginary country of Gondal. The earliest of these, written in 1838-9, are either short lyrics, or groups of fragments, evidently outlines for longer poems which she had not yet enough skill to complete, but in 1841 and 1842 she wrote the narrative poems nos 143 and 154, both revised in 1844, which show that she had acquired the necessary control of her medium. The Gondal poems were the means by which Emily learnt to write poetry. In them she embodied emotional experiences for which she had no other words, mental states, not actual events. They were the children of her imagination, but not of her strange mystical vision, which faded during the time that she was absorbed in them. In 1843 she wrote some lines in a Gondal fragment reversing those of 1837 (no. 160). In 1844 the vision returned, but she no longer accepted it with childlike simplicity; reason told her to reject it as a 'fond creation' of fancy (no. 170), and there are several poems where glimpses of the vision are seen through doubt and conflict (nos. 168, 170, 174, 181), but in October 1844 she defied reason and accepted the mingled rapture and agony of the mystical experience.

My Darling Pain that wounds and sears
And wrings a blessing out of tears. (no. 176)

It was after this acceptance that she attained complete expression, and wrote the two poems by which she is remembered, 'Cold in the Earth' (no. 182, 3 March 1845) and 'No Coward Soul is Mine' (no. 191, 2 Jan. 1846). To these must be added lines 66-92 of the Gondal poem (no. 190, 9 Oct. 1845) headed *Julian M. to A. G. Rochelle*. These lines, with some adaptations, probably by Emily herself, were published in *Poems by Currer, Ellis and Acton Bell* under the title of *The Prisoner, a Fragment*. She must have realized that their power made the Gondal setting appear childish. Here at last she was able to put into words not altogether inadequate her mystical experience.

MADELEINE HOPE DODDS

GATESHEAD

Anglo-American Literary Relations. By GEORGE STUART GORDON. Oxford University Press. 1942. 119 pp. 5s.

The death of George Gordon over a year ago took away from our midst one of the most attractive of English scholars. He wrote little, but what he wrote had quality and reflected his wide reading, his zest for letters, and his urbanity and wit. Magdalen College gained from its President what scholarship lost in part from the former Merton Professor.

The pious labours of Dr Chapman have ensured that some part, not the least important, of his unpublished writings should see the light, in this book, containing six lectures delivered at University College, London, on the Watson Chair Foundation of the Sulgrave Manor Board. One cannot praise too highly the skill and restraint with which Dr Chapman has edited Gordon's remains, for there was much to be done to the material available. The subject was one that appealed greatly to Gordon, and one that might have resulted in a very notable work, had he lived to work further upon it and to complete his survey.

He was aware of the importance of those later stages in his subject which he was, in fact, highly competent to deal with:

As the twentieth century approaches—the interaction of the two countries, in literature as in everything else, grows more habitual and intense: authors, publishers, and readers all swimming in an element sometimes highly and characteristically national, sometimes hardly to be distinguished as either English or American, but rather a trader's compound of the two. (p. 82)

But he set this aside, regrettably perhaps, to deal instead with the 'copyright quarrel'.

When one considers in the mass observations by distinguished American writers upon England, and by distinguished English writers upon the United States, one may wonder how goodwill, literary or political, survived. I well remember encountering the last ripples of a sturdy tide of resentment in Wisconsin raised by a visit from Matthew Arnold, for good reason, I thought. But the truth is, that the very measure of these repercussions is the measure of the fundamental unity of the two peoples. A German visitor, or even a French visitor, to either country leaves them unperturbed. But Hawthorne's acerbities disturbed England, as Dickens's acerbities disturbed America. And there is joy among all angels when, on either side of the Atlantic, we can trace the essential kinship of a Carlyle to an Emerson. Not for nothing was Carlyle, as Gordon relates (pp. 51–2), the first English man of letters to be invited to go to America, over a hundred years ago. Or that Coleridge, a vast admirer of the American Republic, sought a new New World there, 'Britain with elbow-room' (p. 40).

Each of the six of Gordon's lectures in this book might well be—one may hope that they will be—expanded into a book. And the authors-to-be of such books may well take example from the temper and spirit of the lecturer. It would be much to ask that they should rival the fresh and gay delight of his style.

C. J. Sisson

LONDON

The Bases of Artistic Creation. Essays by MAXWELL ANDERSON, RHYS CARPENTER, ROY HARRIS. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1942. 70 pp. \$ 1.25.

This is a small but thought-provoking book, with much of the urgency of the spoken, and well-spoken, word. Its contents are three papers, 'The Basis of Artistic Creation in Literature', by Maxwell Anderson, 'The Basis of Artistic Creation in Music', by Roy Harris, 'The Basis of Artistic Creation in the Fine Arts', by Rhys Carpenter, followed by two brief Commentaries, on Dr Carpenter's essay by Joseph Sloane, on Mr Harris's by Oscar Thompson. In Mr Harris's very brief discussion of a very big subject, as in Mr Thompson's Commentary, I fear the wind is too strong for the brass; but the other contributions are important. Mr Anderson's paper is a restatement, in modern terms and with arguments resting on the theatre, of an old idea: that every satisfactory, not to say great, work of art must show 'an attitude toward the world', or, to speak more clearly, must be distinguished by its moral excellence. 'Excellence on the stage is always moral excellence. . . . Set Hitler on the stage and loathing will rise from every seat in the house. Even in Germany, if he

were a character in a play, he would be hated and despised.' This is to flatter the Nazi; I cannot so easily grant him the old Athenian virtue, but, indeed, this paper is noteworthy not so much for the newness of its theme or logic of its argument as for its passionate sincerity. Mr Anderson is a famous playwright who finds his religion in the theatre, whose purpose it is to find and hold up to our regard what is admirable in humanity; his account of his rediscovery of the classical standards of dramatic worth is powerful and unambiguous; he believes an artist should know what he is doing. He is thus in and of the everlasting struggle of good with evil, and will be content to have his vigorous contribution to the Rutgers symposium considered as both sermon and literary criticism.

Mr Anderson's essay has nothing to say of the tricks of the dramatist's trade, his technique. Dr Carpenter, on the other hand, says some very wise and pungent things about technical excellence and style. He begins with a discussion of the Grand Tradition of European art, that gradual mastery of all matters geometrical, physical and optical which concern the painter (to take one example only) who would set on canvas his illusionary yet adequate presentation of the world of sight. This mastery attained, by scientific if not artistic progress, he finds the Grand Tradition at an end. The 'universal eclecticism' of our own day, with its explorings of negroid and other exotic art, cubism, surrealism and the like, he analyses as the attempts of men outside a tradition to solve a problem of whose existence but not whose nature they are aware—the problem of style. He is positive that a new style will be evolved from recent and contemporary experiment when artists recapture the sense, however illusory it may be, of creative power. In his last sentences Dr Carpenter links hands with Mr Anderson. 'From the capricious vagaries of modern esthetic experiment will be sorted and sifted something to serve our truest needs. What is thus useful, will survive; whatever is merely dishonest and empty, must perish.'

It is of interest to students of literature as well as of art to find Mr Sloane in his Commentary seeking the end of the Grand Tradition (he does not question its end) in causes deeper than a loss of style or a too great technical knowledge. The breakdown of religious belief, the loss of a mythology, the spread of the scientific spirit, the rise of genre painting, the withdrawal of patronage—the first three of these have been considered causes of the decline of the Grand Tradition in literature too. That the Grand Tradition in literature has declined so woefully as our more pessimistic contemporaries claim appears to the reviewer far from certain. Similarly it may appear to some of Dr Carpenter's readers that he is conniving at a premature burial. But of the value of his survey there can be no question.

GWYN JONES

ABERYSTWYTH

Critical Theory and Practice of the Pléiade. By ROBERT J. CLEMENTS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xviii + 288 pp. 16s. 6d.

Rightly maintaining that any study of the Pléiade's poetics based only on the theoretical writings and on those observations embodied in a few major

poems is incomplete, Mr Clements has sought to fill out the system by taking into account the judgements of the poets on each other and on other writers ancient and modern. This leads him to survey the literary traditions inherited or adopted by the Pléiade. The result is the collection between two covers of a vast amount of material, most of which conveniently groups itself into five main chapters dealing with the Pléiade's frequently self-contradictory attitudes to truth and the *art de feindre*, their pursuit of glory and renunciation of it, their indecision between a natural desire for clarity and a sneaking regard for poetic obscurity, their compromises between sweetness and utility, and, most important of all, their ideas on art and nature in poetic composition. A sixth chapter, 'Concluding Remarks', is not a mere summary of results obtained but raises a number of interesting points encountered during investigations. There is no doubt that new light is thrown on many corners of the Pléiade's theories, and that the imposing mass of evidence may enrich and perhaps correct opinions currently held.

The book is beautifully produced, the references and index a model of clarity. The investigations have been so carefully done that the one adverse criticism possible may seem ungrateful. It is that the work smacks a little, overmuch of 'our card file' (p. 259). The *fiche* system, indispensable to most workers in a complex field of investigation, can produce certain undesirable results, of which two are occasionally visible in this work. First, the temptation to put all the evidence in the body of the text leads to the reader being overwhelmed by much repetition of similar matter. But many a book would shrink to an article if the temptation were resisted. Secondly, classification by a keyword may produce wrong placings or misinterpretations when the book comes to be written. Thus (p. 178) the passage quoted from Vauquelin deals not (as Mr Clements says) with the imitation of the creative processes of the *alambiqueur* producing a 'sacred fury', but with the danger run by the overweening poet (who may, like a wicked *alambiqueur*, go to the bad) of being struck mad by an avenging God. So (p. 224), it is not to a 'specific star' that Passerat is referring but to a comet described in perfectly traditional manner. So also (p. 244) the word *passion* in the first Du Bellay extract refers not to *amour*, as its placing suggests, but to 'suffering' in the etymological sense of both words.

Nevertheless, the author's judgements on the wider issues are sound and well supported, and I cannot refrain from quoting one which can hardly be overstressed (p. 265): 'we cannot help but wish that the newly discovered classic literatures had served less as models to copy and more as examples of literary independence and originality to rival.'

H. W. LAWTON

SOUTHAMPTON

Le Classicisme français. By HENRI PEYRE. New York: Éditions de la Maison française. 1942. 281 pp.

This is a second version, entirely rewritten, of the author's earlier study, *Qu'est-ce que le Classicisme?* (Droz, 1935), which is now out of print. In it Professor Peyre examines the literature of the age of Louis XIV in its essence, in its relations to the other great literatures, and finally to Neo-Classicism.

His book belongs therefore to the domain of comparative studies; and in this matter his exceptional knowledge of Greek and English Literature, and the penetrating observations he makes on Italian, Spanish and German, show him as singularly well-qualified to understand and interpret that period of their literature to which Frenchmen return with an admiration perennially renewed.

The picture he draws here is one of the first, certainly the best we know, in which it has been possible to incorporate the sometimes revolutionary findings of modern research. It is completed with features which perhaps he alone was qualified to add. He is probably right in holding that Descartes exercised little influence on these great artists; though we would make an exception for Madame de la Fayette, whose *Princesse de Clèves* thinks and acts (and even speaks) so entirely in harmony with the *Traité des Passions* that it is hard not to believe, with Victor Cherbuliez, that the author was very familiar with it. The men of the seventeenth century, for the most part, seem to have disdained the past and admired their own age. A small number of great writers respected the 'Ancients', and a handful of *littérateurs*, like Maucroix and his friends who figure in *Les Amours de Psyché*, may have 'adored' them; but none felt that mingling of regret and nostalgia for the ancient world, which first appeared with Keats and Shelley. If Malebranche (as one may here recall) inveighed against the exaggerated respect for Antiquity, he was thinking of an attitude that was largely and perhaps exclusively confined to scholars, and scholars were then often rather pedants than literary men. The seventeenth century was, in Professor Peyre's view, less influenced by the Ancients than any other century since the Renaissance.¹

One of the reasons he finds for the greatness of seventeenth-century literature is in the relations of confidence that existed between artist and public: with this he shows the contrast of the distrust and disharmony of recent times. The 'Grands Classiques', who wished to please 'les honnêtes gens', were probably lifted to greater heights of achievement by this kind of conscious collaboration. Are we to suppose that a corresponding handicap retards our contemporaries? It would surely be absurd to suggest (nor, of course, does the author do so) that there are not to-day in most of the great western nations a public of 'honnêtes gens' as intelligent and enlightened as existed in the France of Louis XIV, better informed, even more numerous, and quite as eager to support great literature. But it would be hard to deny that they are more separated from each other, more submerged by the multitude of the shallow and the vulgar, and in the literary sense more ineffective than the company of the 'honnêtes gens' of Molière's time. And in most countries, even when authors are living in close touch with one another in some great city or university town, such authors do not feel the backing of the reading public as they did then. There have been partial or local exceptions. In New England, in the last century, there seems to have been something really comparable to the vital collaboration which existed under Louis XIV, and this may to some extent explain the brilliance of that 'flowering' and 'Indian Summer' which Mr Van Wyck Brooks has recently been describing.

¹ This section of his work (pp. 111-18), including the excellent observations on the independence and originality of French tragedy, deserves particular attention.

Elsewhere, and more recently, when a rare talent has made its way, this has been due to special circumstances. Kipling felt himself supported in India by the soldiers and civilians—a small class, but cohesive; and later, in this country, by corresponding social groups. Conrad, mured to the loneliness of the sea, was strong enough to go on producing until he, so to speak, created a public which *then and then only* supported him. But in the absence of such rare circumstances, the declining level of contemporary literature may be due, not simply to declining talent, but in some measure to the absence of that support of a discerning public without which it is less easy for an artist to give of his best.

There are debatable things in this book; but even where the reader may differ from Professor Peyre's conclusions, the latter are usually so moderate as almost to reconcile him. Thus, though the author is an undisguised admirer, almost a partisan, of the 'Grands Classiques', he does not favour the extreme anti-Romanticism of certain French and English critics. Guessing, as we do, that his defence of Racine—and of Racine as poet—has been provoked by Anglo-Saxon recalcitrance, our first impulse is to wonder whether the taste for Racine is not a matter of national sensibility. But the hypothesis, though tempting, is surely unsound; there are canons of excellence in art, and good taste is not relative. If many of us feel in Musset a greater dramatic poet than Racine, we can at least allege that Musset was one of the most French of French poets, and that a certain reserve in admiration for Racine has been shared by many French critics.

This is a book rich in fact and observation, stimulating to discussion, one which makes many critical works seem tedious or insipid; a book to be read and reread and communicated to one's students.

A. LYTTON SELLS

DURHAM

Jean-François de Boissy (1704–1754). By CLAIRE-ELIANE ENGEL. Université de Neuchâtel. 1941. 118 pp. Sw. FRs. 4.

Mlle Engel has made a real 'find'. She has culled from the correspondence of a French Protestant, who spent the years 1741–54 as a refugee in Switzerland and Holland, a series of highly readable letters and extracts which she has linked together by a discreet and competent commentary. The letters are valuable, not as those of a celebrity but as of an intelligent witness stimulated by the foreign environment into which he was thrown. This modest private tutor evinces a lively interest in new books and scientific experiments and possesses at times 'un joli brin de plume'. Among the literary novelties about which he has something to say are the *Encyclopédie*, Rousseau's first Discourse, *Pamela*, and the French periodicals published in Holland. A serious reader, he is no mere bookworm or pedant, and life in Holland or travel in Germany provides him at times with matter for vivid and picturesque description. He gives an entertaining account of the coronation of the Emperor in 1745 and of the Imperial Court, and a delightful sketch of life at Spa, where by a strange regulation visitors taking the waters were forbidden to read or write before 5 p.m. He makes piquant observations at the Dutch universities whither he accompanies his pupils. At Utrecht, 'il n'y a que les professeurs de théologie

qui n'exigent aucun salaire. Les étudiants en cette science vont en robe de chambre à leurs leçons. Pour les autres, juristes, médecins, ils n'y paraissent qu'habillés' (p. 28). At Leyden, 'on croque les sciences' and 'M. Albinus démontre un cadavre avec une propreté et une élégance de latiniste qui plaît beaucoup' (pp. 52, 53). He deplores the imprudent zeal of certain fellow Protestants living in France—'gens à qui la chaleur tient lieu de lumières' (p. 31). On this divergence of view between *émigrés* and *ceux qui restent*, Mlle Engel remarks pointedly: 'C'est l'éternel conflit entre les adeptes de la résistance sur place et ceux de la résistance depuis l'étranger' (p. 25).

Dignified, unambitious, a self-effacing scholar, a lover of country sights and sounds, Boissy is brought before us very vividly in this correspondence, which at the same time casts light on the first half of the eighteenth century. It is with justice that Mlle Engel writes of these letters: 'Elles révèlent une personnalité et une époque.'

F. C. ROE

ABERDEEN

La Philosophie de Marcel Proust. By SYBIL DE SOUZA. Paris: Rieder. 1940. 176 pp. 20 fr.

During the last ten years or so the works of Marcel Proust have been the object of much literary research—they have even been the subject of several doctorate theses. The most illuminating and interesting of these studies are that of A. Dandieu, *Marcel Proust, sa révélation psychologique* (Firmin-Didot, 1930) and that of A. Feuillerat, *Comment Proust a composé son roman* (Yale Romanic Studies, 1934). This most recent work, *La Philosophie de Marcel Proust*, does not add anything vital to the bulk of research, and it is not easy to discover why this misleading title has been chosen. Those who seek in it for a statement, an analysis or a criticism of Proust's philosophy will be disappointed, since it is not really his philosophy that this book investigates, but rather the elements which have gone to the formation of his literary consciousness or, perhaps more correctly, his literary subconscious; the influence on him of his reading of Bergson and Ruskin, and of music. These are, in fact, the titles of the three chapters in the second part. The work would have been more correctly named *La Sensibilité de Marcel Proust*.

The book is 170 pages of text divided into four parts. The first of these is 'Les Données Psychologiques', the second 'Influences qui ont contribué à former la notion du réel chez Marcel Proust' (the three chapters mentioned above). The third part is 'La Réalité Transcendante' and the last 'La communication du réel—L'Oeuvre d'Art'. Only the third part—30 pages out of the 170—can truly be said to deal with the subject suggested by the title. The fourth part is merely a study of Proust's methods of composition.

The most interesting and suggestive part is the first, where the author studies the sensibility of Proust and indicates how through his 'mémoire affective' he recaptures and vividly evokes the past.

In the thirty pages in which Miss de Souza attempts to set forth Proust's philosophy she concludes that he believed that there are spiritual forces with which, at rare moments, we can enter into contact, that we have no absolute

proof of them and can only hope to rise to them through suffering. She summarizes his philosophy with a quotation from Feuillerat: 'Proust croyait avoir trouvé en la mémoire affective un moyen d'investigation plus pénétrant qui lui permettait d'élaborer une psychologie dans le temps au lieu de la traditionnelle psychologie plane et grâce à laquelle il comptait faire venir à la lumière des vérités fondamentales. Mais faute d'avoir exprimé en "termes logiques" ces vérités, il n'avait réussi dans son travail de création qu'à montrer des âmes dissociées.' But she has not shown how he used this new psychology nor what he discovered by its means. She ends: 'Mais la croyance à une réalité spirituelle qui est en partie objective, subsiste jusqu'au terme, et c'est par l'œuvre d'art que nous aurons accès au monde de la véritable réalité.' But we are no nearer knowing what was Proust's conception of this 'véritable réalité'. And she concludes with a quotation from Valéry's article in *Hommage à Marcel Proust*, which illuminates nothing, 'Dans ses profondeurs personnelles Marcel Proust a cherché la métaphysique dont aucun monde ne se passe.'

The author has shown that she knows Proust's work well and that she has many interesting things to say about him, that there are many attractive paths that she could have followed if she had not chosen one that seems to have led her only to a dead-end. She might have made a fuller study of 'La Sensibilité de Proust' or 'La Personnalité Morale de Proust'.

Proust wrote in *Le Temps Retrouvé*: 'En réalité chaque lecteur est, quand il lit, le lecteur de soi-même.' Miss de Souza's researches suggest a possible title for a book: *Proust lecteur de lui-même*.

ENID STARKIE

OXFORD

Italian Opinion on America as revealed by Italian Travelers, 1850-1900. By ANDREW J. TORRIELLI. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages, vol. xv.) 1941. viii+330 pp. £1.

Mazzini, with the eagerness of the nineteenth century, wrote PROGRESS all with capitals, making it a law of humanity to be fulfilled in liberty: of the person, of belief, of thought and its expression, of association, of trade. All these liberties were imprescriptibles. The republic was the only legitimate form of government. The Press must be boundlessly free. In principles the America of the travellers corresponded closely to this ideal, and Garlanda hailed there all the freedoms on which Europe could only theorize (p. 32). But Mazzini had seen dangers in freedom, and countered them by insisting all the more on duties as the path to rights. That is the expression of his own idealism. 'Il faut que le pouvoir arrête le pouvoir'—and *nimiam potestas* does not long admit of theoretic checks. By the side of those who look optimistically to America as to Europe's antidote, seeing it in terms of principles, are those who look to the *verità effettuale*. The release of liberty for the individual did not mean liberty for all. 'Caccia quoted the filthiness of the streets, for no official would dare to challenge the consolidated vote of the street-cleaners' (p. 211). And in more important matters free initiative, the sanctity of competitive methods, and of business, led to disastrous conditions for those

who fell in the race for well-being. Transfer that observation to the international plane, and it was the indifference of the U.S.A. to the struggles of other and poorer nations (pp. 271-2).

There are remarks in this book which point the contrast with Italy, as was Mr Torrielli's expressed intention. 'I popoli latini si acconciano facilmente a dormire i loro sonni sotto la tutela di chi vuol pigliarsi la briga di governare la cosa pubblica' (p. 82). That was made in 1886, and it throws light on the Italy of Giolitti, then in process of formation, as well as on that of Mussolini, often thought of as an opposite. But all the illustration of detail lights up the U.S.A., and affords an introduction to America, and its problems. In these pages will be found a glimpse of the tremendous achievements of the U.S.A.; and the notion that it had achieved nothing. In one sense the last thing that utilitarianism can think about is *use*; and the fierce commercial energy of the U.S.A. seemed to many Europeans to be directed by no sense of a goal. It was, to use an architectural image, the Gothic world of practical science advancing in all directions; not the voluntary limitation of technique of the Renaissance from a neo-classic concern for the principles that govern beauty. 'They knew and studied the principles of the fine arts, and yet the only result was a prostitution of all they had learned. . . . Transitoriness was the theme of American life' (p. 247). 'For to the American change was an essential feature of progress' (p. 116). Out of the Vitruvian trilogy, *firmitas*, *commoditas*, *venustas*, nineteenth-century America selected the middle component only. They built for 'the normal span of time', then their work could be pulled down for something better. 'That was progress' (p. 295).

But to the European—and Mr Torrielli stands half-way between Europe and America—that middle component has no meaning by itself. In spite of the lure of rich America for the poor, and newly humiliated, Latin races, the sentence of Europe for Mr Torrielli is in the words of the Spanish captain, a prisoner freed after the war of 1898: 'Son pazzi, son pazzi! Quando avranno corso tanto dove credono mai d'arrivare?' (p. 291). Mr Torrielli's book, with its careful, and well-presented, survey of new ground, belongs to the era of reflexion. For the European it gives information which he does not possess; for the American it offers matter for thought on the goal of progress. For both it provides a useful introduction to the problem of the interplay of two civilizations. The Europe of the future will not be able to re-echo Georges Duhamel's cry to combat in his *Scènes de la Vie Future*. But the matter of adjustments cannot be too widely studied, and Mr Torrielli's book affords a useful vantage-ground.

J. H. WHITFIELD

OXFORD

GIL VICENTE, *Tragicomedia de Don Duados*. Editada por DAMASO ALONSO.

I: Texto, Estudios y Notas. (Biblioteca Hispano-Lusitana, 1.) Madrid:

Instituto Antonio de Nebrija. 1942. 326 pp. 18 pesetas.

This volume is one-half of a most important work. The other half is to consist of exact reproduction of the two early texts, 1562 and 1586. There is, however, no doubt about the superiority of the text of 1562, revised by the poet's son

Luis, at almost all points. In this volume a readable text is offered, so that almost every student has all he wants in the one volume.

The introduction is a literary estimate, of exquisitely sensitive quality. Sr Alonso has, I believe, exceeded even his own now classical preface to Góngora's *Soledades*, while dealing with an author who has almost nothing in common with that work. It might be Draconian legislation to require all critics to graduate into their art by composing some first-rate poetry; but it is certain that experience of composition counts for much in Sr Alonso's introductions. He knows so finely what his author wishes to do. The rest is a matter of very delicate balance. It is no harder to enjoy Vicente than to enjoy a ballad or to enjoy Izaak Walton, but to say where the pleasure is found is a very subtle art, especially with the condition that one must not overwhelm the author with pompous impertinences. Gil Vicente's quality is (as Sr Alonso says) 'una autenticidad de voz delgada', and akin to indefinable felicities in Garcilaso de la Vega.

After the introduction comes the text, and after the text a careful study entitled 'Problemas del Castellano Vicentino'. In this essay the other facet of Sr Alonso's genius is seen—his scrupulous philology. His solution of the problem is best given in his own words:

Gil Vicente está en la encrucijada de los vientos, en la encrucijada de su portugués nativo, su leonés inicial, su castellano sobrepuesto; en la división de las aguas del castellano medieval y el clásico, entrecruzada aun con la del portugués medieval y el clásico; en el punto de choque de una gran tradición literaria castellana, con una, modesta, sí, pero familiar, tradición castellanizante portuguesa. . . Entre tantas fuerzas no había más que una posibilidad: la de la vacilación y el titubeo. (p. 153)

That is very well said; for the fine details I must refer the reader to Sr Alonso's text. It may be noted here that he prefers 'leonés' to the traditional term 'sayagués', since, as everybody knows, 'sayagués' was unknown at Sayago (Zamora). On the whole I prefer the older term, since it marks this element in Vicente's Castilian as artificial and literary. There is one point which Sr Alonso does not, in my judgement, quite clear up. He uses the term 'castellano' as meaning always one and the same thing, veritable Castilian. I suspect his use of 'castellano' would mystify Gil Vicente. The poet went out of business in 1535 or 1536, before any of Garcilaso's poems or Valdés's prose was in circulation, and therefore before the Castilian standard had been set. It is true that there was already an abundant Castilian literature, but manuscripts mostly showed dialectal marks of Leonese or Aragonese. They were not Leonese or Aragonese texts, but 'Castilian' after their manner; the notion of 'castellano' in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries allowed for vacillation, and those who spoke it at the courts of Manuel the Fortunate and John III must have brought their local variations with them. 'Castellano', for Sr Alonso, is a sure rule and certain standard; for Vicente it was a variable pattern, and if he had sought authority, the best available was Nebrija, whose right to express any opinion (being an Andaluz) was at this time denied by Juan de Valdés.

After the linguistic essay come most valuable notes. I must succumb to the temptation to add my mite to the exegesis of

Este es el calbi ora bi
el calbi sol fa mellorado.

Sr Alonso defends the text against Dona Carolina's emendation 'sol fa mi do'. There is no doubt as to the reading: what is its sense? One is struck by the Portuguese or Leonese (or Aragonese) *mellorado*. We must accept Sr Alonso's linguistic premiss 'No imaginar un Gil Vicente constantemente estúpido, constantemente desacertado en el uso castellano, sin una causa para el desacierto'. What is the cause which made him prefer *mellorado* to *mejorado*? I suggest it was something like this: If a modern Englishman is crooning *My country 'tis of thee*, he is likely enough to go on with *tum-tum-ty tiddle-ee*, i.e. to represent notes without words, but in the rhyme to conserve the vocalism of *liberty*. Julián is also crooning (ll. 1321-2), but his original is Arabic. He keeps on by naming the notes *sol fa*, and then seeks a word that gives the vowels of the notes in the rhyme, *mellorado*, probably for *me do re do*. If so, it is clear that the syllable *llo* would serve his turn, but not the harsh *jo*, and therefore *mellorado*, not *mejorado*. It is interesting to note that the cadence *sol fa me do re do* is not that of Salinas's version of the tune. If A is *do*, then Salinas's tune begins with *re me fa*, and, curiously enough, the Castilian words substituted for the Arabic original contain the first and third vowels *rey don A(lonso)*, while the line ends *re do re do*, also echoed by vowels *rey mi señor*.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

SHORT NOTICES

Once more we owe to Dr F. S. Boas the twenty-first volume of *The Year's Work in English Studies* covering the year 1940 (Edited for the English Association. Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. 267 pp. 10s. 6d.). He has secured the services of Miss Una Ellis-Fermor, Miss Dorothy Whitelock, and Mr Arnold Davenport to fill war vacancies in his editorial ranks, so that the volume continues to have the benefit of the labours of a competent and authoritative group of contributors, as for the 1939 volume.

The year is marked by two outstanding pieces of scholarship, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, by Professor Manly and Dr Edith Rickert, and *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, edited by Mr F. N. W. Bateson. For the rest, it is a year of achievements on a minor scale, though one might single out for especial mention *The Book of Margery Kempe*, edited by E. B. Meech and Hope Emily Allen, Mr J. M. Osborn's *John Dryden*, and Mr Basil Willey's *Eighteenth Century Background*, as works of real importance. One voice only speaks out of the disastrous silence of German scholarship, Dr Willie Héraucourt's *Die Wertwelt Chaucers*, the fruit of a recent visit to England by a former lover of England who found a warm welcome among us.

Conditions of space limit Dr Boas's contributors, it is true. But a greater measure of guidance upon the value or validity of the work recorded would be acceptable. In this respect the various chapters are not all helpful to the same degree. Dr David Daiches, referred to on p. 239 as an American, is in fact of Scottish birth, though now in the United States.

One can only repeat, for the rest, that we owe to the English Association, and to Dr Boas and his contributors, an indispensable instrument of scholarship.

C. J. Sisson

LONDON

Advocates of English spelling reform will find abundant food for thought in Sir William Craigie's latest monograph on *Some Anomalies of Spelling* (S.P.E. Tract, LIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1942. 26 pp. 3s. 6d.). This tract is limited in its scope to the illustration of those inconsistencies within the traditional types which are justified neither by having a practical value nor by being historically valid. In its restricted field, therefore, it is fairly exhaustive and, handy for reference, it is full of carefully marshalled information. It is, indeed, a valuable supplement to the author's well-known manual on *English Spelling, Its Rules and Reasons* (1928). Here and there one finds a welcome addition to one's knowledge of English sounds. For example, an intermediate stage of the unusual change from χ to f in *laugh* and *tough*, *slough* (skin) and *duff* (variant of *dough*) is recorded for a Border dialect of Scottish in which the χ of words like *lauch* and *loch* is accompanied by lip-rounding. Our accepted orthography is shown to be largely a product of the first half of the seventeenth century. By printers, more than by scribes, the varied spellings of the previous century were reduced to uniformity. There was ample scope for choice among different forms 'according to the habits, taste, or learning of author, scribe, or printer'. A purely physical factor may have contributed to the compositor's choice. It became more and more natural for him, especially when engaged on urgent tasks in the Civil War, to move mechanically to the same compartment in his case when setting up a word instead of deliberately choosing between two or more alternatives. After all, the first function of written language is to convey meaning and not (like musical notation) to record sound. The author issues a gentle warning to those who would change our spelling drastically. Attempts to record Gaelic and Faeröese phonetically have not justified themselves and have not won general acceptance. It may be too readily assumed that a phonetic spelling must necessarily be the most suitable for any language without regard to its character or history.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

The aim of Dr Alan Fagan Herr's dissertation, *The Elizabethan Sermon: A Survey and a Bibliography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1940. 169 pp.), is modest and he has achieved it, on the whole, competently. Chapters I-VII, which sketch the conditions in which sermons were preached and printed, are valuable in that they make clear some important differences between Elizabethan and twentieth-century conceptions of the nature and function of the sermon and its part in social activity. The last chapter, however ('The Literary Value of the Sermons'), does not satisfy. It is true that the greatest preachers were somewhat irregular in the construction of their sermons (not 'quite irregular' as Mr Herr claims), but it does not follow that treatises setting out rules for sermon construction were of as little importance as the general tenour of the chapter suggests. They affected men

of diverse gifts in diverse ways, but their effects were none the less marked: the weak were upheld and ordered in the discharge of their duty to preach, the strong were hampered and the flow of their thought too much accommodated to the fixity of the mould into which it had to run. Moreover, the effect reached beyond the Elizabethan period, for the stylizing of the sermon led to the growth, within its frame, of the hothouse cultures of Thomas Adams and his like. Of the judgements on specific preachers contained in this chapter, that which depreciates Henry Smith is particularly ill-supported.

The extensive bibliography of sermons presented in this book should prove both welcome and useful.

W. M. T. DODDS

LONDON

Dr Eugene Hulse Sloane's dissertation (*Robert Gould, Seventeenth-Century Satirist*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1940. 126 pp. No price given), presented to the University of Pennsylvania for the D.Phil. degree, pursues rather interestingly what might be regarded as a dull theme. Whether fame has justly excluded Gould from her record (while including Oldham and Garth, Duke, Halifax and King) is a nice question. Dr Sloane does his best for him, and indeed at times, in parts of his *Satire Against Man* and his *Jack Pavy*, we begin to wonder if the examiners have not been rather hard on this candidate for fame. But again he is so much a creature of the times, Dryden's weakest shadow in fact, that we decide that he is only interesting on that account. He attempted the usual things in the usual way, and we see no reason to quarrel with his own realization of his mediocrity. Still Dr Sloane places him neatly against his Restoration-Revolution background.

G. KITCHIN

EDINBURGH

The pseudonymous Captain Samuel Brunt's fantasy, *A Voyage to Cacklogallinia*, was well worth reproducing from the original edition of 1727 (New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, for the Facsimile Text Society. 1940. xv + 167 pp. 14s. 6d.), and Professor Marjorie Nicholson's introduction is that of an expert and an enthusiast. Apart from the interests of the book brought by her to our attention, there are others, e.g. the linguistic, not only in Brunt's English (*slashes*, p. 25; *artist*, p. 27; *wherret*, p. 67), but also in the sources and derivations of his Cacklogallinian lingo, from such obvious creations as *squabbaw*, *caja*, *venenugallpotior*, *Bubohibonians*, or *Liparia*, to more recondite efforts. There is material for consideration whether 'Captain Brunt' was, in fact, a Catholic, or was not (pp. 85, 105, 149, 163). Certainly his Moon-world is a sort of unorthodox Purgatory. The author's sudden rise on wings of prose-song (p. 136) is most instructive in respect of eighteenth-century poetry. And I can recall no earlier statement of the beauties of vegetarianism (pp. 147-8). The original printer can hardly be complimented, except on his title-page. The misprint on p. 75 is more likely to occur in linotype. Perhaps the stick slipped. The reproduction is very satisfactory. On p. xi *Shaknameh* should be *Shahnameh*. We are grateful for this delightful book.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

Dr Herbert Starr, in his dissertation on *Gray as a Literary Critic* (University of Pennsylvania. 1941. vi+144 pp.), makes a full presentation of the fragmentary and scattered material contained in the prose essays and correspondence. The work fully confirms the general estimate of Gray as one of the 'lame giants' of eighteenth-century criticism. He was potentially a great critic, but never cared to use his remarkably wide scholarship and sound taste for the avowed purpose of criticism, an activity which he despised, thinking 'a bad verse as good a thing or better than the best observation that was ever made upon it'. Despite this disclaimer, it is clear from his essays, letters and comments recorded by his friends that he is far ahead of most of his critical contemporaries. Dr Starr demonstrates to the full Gray's use of the historical perspective, backed by his reading and understanding of classical, medieval and Elizabethan literature, broadened by a knowledge of Norse and Welsh, his lack of faith in the mechanical rules as the sole standards of literary judgement and his stress on the imagination as the most essential factor in the production of great poetry. A fuller and more accurate account of the critical interests of the eighteenth century than is given in the first chapter would have provided useful comparisons for an estimate of Gray as a critic. Dr Starr's discussion of the topic of 'imagination' is weakened by an apparent confusion between the term 'invention' derived from rhetorical usage to mean the 'discovery' of suitable subject-matter and the modern use of the word for imaginative elaboration. For 'Wolsey', p. 108, read 'Wolseley'.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

Richard Tickell's *Anticipation*, now edited, with a Bibliography of Tickell's Writings, by Mr L. H. Butterfield (New York: King's Crown Press. 1942. xi+97 pp. \$1.50) was first published in 1778 and went into ten editions that year, but Mr Butterfield's is the first reprint since 1822. It was an anticipation, by way of parody, of the first day's debate of the House of Commons in the session 1778-9, the subject debated was the war with the American Colonies, and among the speakers are Wilkes, Burke, Fox, Luttrell and Lord North. The parody is both reasonable and witty, the undoubted levity of the whole design (approved by Lord North) most significant. Mr Butterfield's apparatus is designed to make this long-forgotten pamphlet still readable by those whose knowledge of the period does not run to detail, and his Notes draw skilfully on contemporary sources. The Bibliography adds some new titles to the list of Tickell's writings.

GWYN JONES

ABERYSTWYTH

Dr William John Phillips, in his *France on Byron* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1941. 81 pp. No price given), despite some immaturities of style, provides his important theme with adequate illustration from the French critics and draws what we may take to be, on the whole, the right inferences. Whilst giving due place to the French reaction to Byron's life and personality, he rightly makes *Don Juan* the *pièce de résistance*—what enlightened French opinion would make of that being of as great interest as the English reaction

to it. Dr Phillips's enquiry does not bring anything very new to light, but it is amusing to note that the moralistic objection to Byron's masterpiece was as strong in France as it was here.

G. KITCHIN

EDINBURGH

Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature (Cornell University Studies in English, xxxi. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. 1940. xv+239 pp. 9s. 6d.) is a reprint with many additions of a smaller pamphlet of the same name, and Professor Lane Cooper's aim is to supply in a compact form extracts from the work of poets and critics who have defined their conception of artistic purpose. He has classified these passages in order, showing first the preoccupation with method understood as the necessity for law and order in poetic art, then passing to the bond between rigorous method and the artistic utterance of passion.

The range of the extracts is wide; it begins with Milton's praise of discipline as fundamental to the whole life of man, and passes from Horace, Ben Jonson, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Balzac to the work of Browning, Dante and Herbert, illustrating method in the poetry of love.

Whether or not every reader finds this very individual collection to his taste, it will give the student of literary principles much varied and useful material.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

Two useful critical editions of French seventeenth-century plays come from the Johns Hopkins Press. That of Jourdan's *Susanna* of 1653 (edited by Sister Coffey, Johns Hopkins Studies, vol. xli. London: H. Milford. 1942. 127 pp. \$1.25) allows us to read a successful example of the Jesuit school drama, played before the Court in 1653, of which a French résumé is extant. The Intermèdes which apparently accompanied performance are an interesting departure from the 'sacred and edifying' character which the Latin language was supposed to preserve. Apart from the bibliography, which contains some serious errors, the edition is a sound piece of work.

The second reprint is even more interesting (*Les Illustres Fous*, of Charles Beys, edited by Merle Protzman, Johns Hopkins Studies, vol. xlii. London: H. Milford. 1942. 211 pp. \$1.25). The collated versions of this play by Beys (whose brother served in Molière's first company) show that what was in 1636 a 'tragi-comédie' was twenty years later a 'comédie', and that artificial names such as Aronte and Celidan were replaced by the more colourful Don Alfonte and Dom Gomez. The source of the main plot is apparently a novel by Lope de Vega, but the follies of the French play have a more complicated history than the editor suggests. They would seem to be a last ripple of the 'Fool' literature which swept Europe in the early sixteenth century, and it is curious when reading Beys to note that one of the successful French imitations of Brant's *Ship of Fools* was called 'Le Chemin de l'Ospital', and that the finest product of the whole movement, *The Praise of Folly*, satirizes poets

and philosophers in something of the same strain as Beys (cf. *A Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures*, Cambridge, 1931, pp. 351-60).

W. G. MOORE

OXFORD

Dr Ashton's edition of Rostand's best-known play (*Cyrano de Bergerac*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. 237 pp. 7s. 6d.) will be warmly welcomed in schools and universities. It is excellent. The text is well printed, and a brief introduction gives the student the essential information about Rostand and about the real and the imaginary Cyrano. (Has a Section IV dropped out of the Introduction or is there an error in numeration?) For those who wish to study the play more fully a short bibliography is provided. Twenty pages of closely printed notes furnish a wealth of detail on social life in the seventeenth century and deal concisely and adequately with the difficulties and allusions of the text. Dr Ashton has once again shown that he possesses the secret of being at once scholarly and entertaining.

F. C. ROE

ABERDEEN

In his *Short History of German Literature* (London: Methuen. 1942. 147 pp. 6s.) Professor Gilbert Waterhouse has expanded the handy outline *German Literature* which he published in 1928 (Benn). The general arrangement remains unaltered, but more space has been given to the political and social background and some pages have been added on the Nazi era. Such an undertaking was bound to be rather an adventure. The author has, however, clearly enjoyed attempting the almost impossible, and as he excels in pithy characterization he maintains our interest to the end. He has aimed at a miniature but coherent picture of German literature, from the angle of an Englishman writing for English readers, and with the older periods at least he has been very successful. About modern German literature tastes, even amongst Englishmen, are bound to differ a good deal. Professor Waterhouse knows what he likes, and that is a good point, provided that his readers do not take everything he says on trust—his opinion for instance that Freytag is the master (German) novelist of the nineteenth century, or that Kafka's *Der Prozess* is grotesquely horrible. One would have liked to see rather more space given to writers such as Rilke (and Kafka!), who have particularly interested contemporary English poets and critics, but this book is only intended to lead the student on to fuller guides to the subject, of which a useful short bibliography is appended, as well as a good index.

W. H. BRUFORD

EDINBURGH

In *The Written and Spoken Word in Norway* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1942. 27 pp. 2s.) Dr Alf Sommerfelt, Director-General of the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Education, has published the address which he delivered as the Taylorian Lecture in 1942. This brief but lucid account of a complicated subject shows how, mainly as a result of political conditions, two distinct languages have developed in Norway: the *Landsmål*, now known as *Nynorsk*

or Neo-Norwegian, and the *Riksmål*, now known as *Bokmål* or the Book language. Dr Sommerfelt's lecture was well worth printing; it contains many illuminating facts on recent developments which will be new to English students. It is interesting to note that, in common with other Scandinavian scholars, the author of this booklet predicts the emergence of a national Norwegian language as the result of a gradual fusion of the two existing languages.

R. J. McCLEAN

LONDON

We have to extend a very hearty welcome to *Polish Science and Learning*, a new periodical edited by the Association of Polish University Professors and Lecturers in Great Britain (No. 1. June 1942. 68 pp. 2s. 6d.), published by the Oxford University Press. The Polish professoriate in refuge with us is exceptionally numerous. It has its own Medical School in Edinburgh, and has later established its own Architectural Centre at Liverpool. Polish students are also the backbone of the special English courses instituted by Birmingham University and of the studies in Social Science arranged for our Allies by the London School of Economics. The new venture appears under the editorship of Professors Glaser, Reddaway, Rose, Skalińska and Zweig (MSS. to J. Borucki, University Museum, Oxford). The text is divided about equally between articles and news of academic interest. The topics raised in this issue cover historiography, economic theory, philosophy, history and law. There is a biographical article on Dybowski, the Baikal explorer. The leading place is justly given to O. Halecki's 'Problems of Polish historiography'. History is constructed after the event, and the event is allowed to cast its shadow over all past time. This has led to gross injustice towards Poland. So far as we in the West have noticed her, it has been under the shadow of the Partitions, and we have looked only for causes leading towards misfortune. We have tended to think of Eastern Europe as almost solely the drama of the rise of Russia. Russian and German historians, who were closer to the facts, were far from disinterested. The Germans, indeed, even started a series of monographs for the purpose of denying that Poland ever had a right to exist! And we have been simple enough, in our ignorance of the language and the milieu, to accept all this tendentious doctrine, ignoring the really considerable services rendered by Poland between the fourteenth and the seventeenth centuries, which include no less than the saving of Christendom in a very black hour. A like cloud has hung over Polish authors. Russian literature is rich enough in the nineteenth century, and contains some authors of unusual distinction; but that is no reason for overlooking Mickiewicz, whose *Pan Tadeusz* is not so far removed from the *Odyssey*, or for forgetting the fact that the sixteenth-century literature of Poland was a comet in the dark night of Eastern Europe. Professor Halecki's exposition of these points deserves the closest attention. English literary and historical scholarship ought not to let itself be led by the nose!

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

NEW PUBLICATIONS

September—December 1942

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English), CLAIR BAIER
and R. J. McCLEAN (German)

GENERAL

- BIEBER, M., *Laocoon. The Influence of the Group since its rediscovery.* Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 7s. 6d.
- KINDT-KIEFER, Über den Satz in der menschlichen Rede. Zur Bindung der Rede an das Gewissen. Bern, Haupt. Swiss fr. 2 40.
- NOLTE, F. O., *Art and Reality.* Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster Press. \$2.00.
- SUNDÉN, K. F., *Linguistic Theory and the Essence of the Sentence* (Goteborgs hogskolas årsskrift, Bd. 47, 5). Goteborg, Wettergren och Kerber, 1941. Kr. 4.
- TYKESSON, E., *Rovarrömanen och dess hjalte.* Lund, Gleerup. Kr. 7.50.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- Handbook of Latin American Studies, 1939*, ed. by L. Hanke and M. Burgin. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- TORRIELLI, A. J., *Italian Opinion on America as Revealed by Italian Travelers, 1850-1900.* Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.

French.

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

- BERGH, Å., *Études d'anthroponymie provençale.* 1. Les noms de personne du polyptyque de Wadalde. (Diss.) Göteborg. Kr. 7.

(b) *Old French.*

- CHRESTIEN DE TROYES, Yvain, ed. by T. B. W. Reid. Manchester, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- Floovant. *Chanson de geste du XII^e siècle*, ed. by S. Andolf. (Diss.) Uppsala, Lunde-
quistska bokhandeln. 1941. Kr. 10.
- The Medieval French Roman d'Alexandre: Vol. iv, *Le Roman du Fier de Gades*
d'Eustache, ed. by E. C. Armstrong and A. Foulet; Vol. v, *Version of Alexandre*
de Paris, ed. by F. B. Agard (Elliott Monographs 39 and 40, bound together).
Princeton, Univ. Press. \$5.00.
- Le roman de Balaan, ed. by M. D. Legge. Manchester, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- SAHLIN, M., *Étude sur la carole médiévale. L'origine du mot et ses rapports avec*
l'église. (Diss.) Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell. 1940. Kr. 4.50.

(c) *Modern French.*

- BAUDELAIRE, C., *Les Fleurs du Mal*, ed. by E. Starkie. Oxford, Blackwell. 7s. 6d.
- BISSEAU, L. A., *Amédée Pichot.* Oxford, Blackwell. 32s.
- CLEMENTS, R. J., *Critical Theory and Practice of the Pléiade.* Harvard and Oxford
Univ. Presses. 16s. 6d.
- MAILLAUD, P., France. (The World To-day.) London, Oxford Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- MONOD-CASSIDY, H., *Un Voyageur-Philosophe au XVIII^e siècle. L'Abbé Jean-Bernard*
Le Blanc. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 28s.
- ROUSSEAU, J.-J., *Les rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, ed. by R. Niklaus. Manchester,
Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- SAINT-PIERRE, B. DE, *Paul et Virginie*, ed. by V. P. Underwood. Manchester, Univ.
Press. 3s. 6d.
- SVENSSON, H., *Franska profiler.* Stockholm, Natur och kultur. 1941. Kr. 6.75.

- VISING, J., George Sands roman *L'homme de neige* (Goteborgs hogskolas årsskrift, Bd. 47, 2). Goteborg, Wettergren och Kerber. 1941. Kr. 1.50.
- WALDO, L. P., *The French Drama in America in the Eighteenth Century and its influence on the American Drama of that period 1701-1800*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

General.

- Germanic Philology. Studies in honor of John Albrecht Walz. Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster Press. 1941. \$3.50.
- HARDING, E., *Språkvetenskapliga problem i ny belysning eller bidrag till nordisk och germansk språkhistoria*, H. 3. Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 3.75.
- JOHANNESSON, T., *Verbal och postverbal partikelkomposition i de germanska språken*. (Diss.) Lund, Lindstedt, 1939. Kr. 12.
- Philological Miscellany. presented to Eilert Ekwall. Uppsala, Lundequistska bokhandeln. Kr. 15.

Dutch.

- KOOLHOVEN, H., *Teach yourself Dutch*. London, English Universities Press. 2s. 6d.
- VERHEUL, J., *Handy Dictionary of the Dutch and English languages*. Philadelphia, McKay. \$1.

Scandinavian.

(a) General (including linguistic).

- HAUGEN, E., *Norwegian Word Studies*. Mimeographed. Madison, Univ. of Wisconsin Press. 1942. \$4.
- LINDEDAL, A., and LUNDBERG, H., *Vanliga framlingsord i svenskan*. Goteborg, 1939. Kr. 15.
- LJUNGGREN, K. G., *Adjektivering av substantiv i svenskan*. Undersökningar i svensk ordbildnings- och betydelselära (Lunds universitets årsskrift, Bd. 35, 3). Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 10.
- MJOBORG, J., *Studier i språkets konst*. Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 4.50.
- PALMÉR, J., *Undersökningar i Olavus Petris språk* (Lunds universitets årsskrift, Bd. 35, 2). Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 6.50.
- THORÉN, I., *Studier över själens tröst* (Nordiska texter och undersökningar, 14). Stockholm, Geber, 1942. Kr. 10.
- WENNSTROM, T., *Studier över språket i Gustav Vasas svenska brev*. Lund, Gleerup, 1941. Kr. 10.
- WENNSTROM, T., *Svenska språkets historia* (Natur och kultur, 147). Stockholm, Natur och kultur, 1941. Kr. 4.
- WESSÉN, E., *De nordiska språken*. Stockholm, Filologiska foren. vid Stockholms hogskola, 1941. Kr. 3.25.
- WESSÉN, E., *Svensk språkhistoria*. Ljudlara och formlara. Stockholm, Filologiska foren. vid Stockholms hogskola, 1941. Kr. 5.50.
- ÅKERLUND, W., *Studier över Ynglingatal* (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund, 23). Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 3.50.
- ÖSTERGREN, O., *Nusvensk ordbok*, H. 71-74 (*Serpentin-skoning*). Stockholm, Wahlström och Widstrand, 1939. For hafte Kr. 1.

(b) Danish.

- BOÖK, F., *Holbergs visdom och andra danska studier*. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1942. Kr. 7.50.

(c) Norwegian.

- BRENEL, H., *Etiske motiv i Henrik Ibsens dramatiska diktning*. (Diss. Uppsala.) Stockholm, Diakonistyr., 1941. Kr. 6.

- NILSSON, J., Kristian Elster 1841-1881. Lund, Gleerup, 1942. Kr. 8.50.
 RUDBERG, S., Bjornsons Fortællinger. En studie i prosastil (Skrifter utgivna av Samfundet for stilforskning, 7.) Stockholm, Geber, 1939. Kr. 3.

(d) *Swedish.*

- AHLGREN, S., Krusenstjerna-studier. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1940. Kr. 4 75.
 BOYE, K., Minnen och studier. Utgivna av M. Abenius och O. Lagercrantz. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1942. Kr. 6.50.
 BRODIN, L., Froken på Mårbacka. En bok om manniskan Selma Lagerlof. Bibhoflupp. Uppsala Svensk hembygd, 1940. Kr. 18.50.
 EK, S., Nationella gestalter i Runebergs ungdomsdiktning (Skrifter utgivna av Modersmåslärarnas forening, 58). Lund, Gleerup, 1940. 75 ore.
 EKLUND, J. A., Erik Gustaf Geijer. Stockholm, Diakonistyr., 1942. Kr. 5.50.
 FOGELQVIST, T., Erik Axel Karlfeldt. Stockholm, Norstedt, 1940. Kr. 15.
 FRIDHOLM, R., Thorild och antiken. (Diss.) Goteborg, 1940. Kr. 7.50.
 GULLBERG, H., Berattarkonst och stil i Per Hallstroms prosa. (Diss.) Goteborg, Wettergren och Kerber, 1939. Kr. 10.
 HEDVALL, R., Runeberg och hans diktning. Stockholm, Fahlerantz och Gumælius, 1941. Kr. 8.50.
 HILDEBRAND, K.-G., Bibeln i nutida svensk lyrik, Stockholm, Diakonistyr., 1939. Kr. 5.25.
 HOLMBERG, O., Sex kapitel om Stagnelius. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1941. Kr. 12.50.
 JOSEPHSON, L., Kellgren och samhället. Kritik och satir till mitten av 1780-talet. Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell, 1942. Kr. 8.
 KAMRAS, H., Den unge Heidenstam. Personlighet och idéutveckling. Stockholm, Geber, 1942. Kr. 10.
 LAMM, M., August Strindberg. Fore Infernokrisen. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1940. Kr. 15.
 LINDER, E. H., Hjalmar Bergman. En profilteckning. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1940. Kr. 6.50.
 LINDER, E. H., Hjalmar Bergmans ungdom. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1942. Kr. 18.
 ODSTEDT, A.-M., Dan Andersson. En levnadsteckning, Stockholm, Natur och kultur, 1941. Kr. 8.
 OLLÉN, G., Strindbergs 1900-talslyrik. (Diss.) Stockholm, Seelg, 1941. Kr. 8.
 OLSSON, H., Från Wallin till Fröding. Studier i svensk adertonhundratalsdikt. Stockholm, Geber, 1939. Kr. 6.75.
 RISBERG, B., Fredmans epistlar. Text och tydning. Stockholm, Saxon och Lindstrom, 1941. Kr. 2.75.
 SAWICKI, S., Die Eufemiavisor, Stilstudien zur nordischen Reimliteratur des Mittelalters (Skrifter utg. av Kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, 28). Lund, Gleerup, 1939. Kr. 10.
 SYDOW, C. W. von, Våra folksagor (Natur och kultur, 146). Stockholm, Natur och kultur, 1941. Kr. 3.
 SYLWAN, O., Johan Henric Kellgren. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1939. Kr. 9.50.
 SYLWAN, O., Realism i 1700-talets roman (Göteborgs hogskolas årsskrift, Bd. 47). Goteborg, Wettergren och Kerber, 1941. Kr. 3.
 WARENDH, T. P., Tegnér och teologien. (Diss., Lund.) Stockholm, Diakonistyr., 1939. Kr. 7.

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

- For Hilaire Belloc. Essays in Honour of his 72nd Birthday, ed. by D. Woodruff. London, Sheed and Ward. 9s.
 HUTTON, E., Catholicism and English Literature. London, Muller. 8s. 6d.
 KÖKERTZ, H., The Place-Names of the Isle of Wight (Nomina Germanica, 6). Uppsala, Lundequistska bokh. 1941. Kr. 12.

Masters of English Literature, ed. by P. S. Wood. Vol. i. New York, Macmillan. \$3.25.
 PHILIPSON, U., Political Slang 1750-1850 (Lund Studies in English, 9). Lund, Gleerup, 1941. Kr. 10.

Year's Work in English Studies, The, xxi, 1940, ed. by F. S. Boas. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

ANDERSON, O. S., Old English material in the Leningrad manuscript of Bedes Ecclesiastical History (Skrifter utg. av Kungl. humanistiska retenskapssamfundet i Lund, 31). Lund, Gleerup, 1941. Kr. 15.

BEHRE, F., Thomas Castleford's Chronicle, ed. in parts with comments (Goteborgs hogskolas årsskrift, Bd. 46, 2: 1-2). Goteborg, Wettergren and Kerber, 1940. Kr. 15.

DAS, S. K., Cynewulf and the Cynewulf Canon. Calcutta, Calcutta Univ. Press.

EKSELIUS, P., A study on the development of the Old English combinations *āht/ōht* in Middle English. (Akad. avh.) Uppsala, Appelberg, 1940.

LIEDHOLM, A., A phonological study of the Middle English romance, Arthour and Merlin (MS. Auchinleck). (Akad. avh.) Uppsala, Ålmqvist and Wiksell, 1941.

LOFRENBERG, M. J., Studies in Middle English Local Surnames (Lund Studies in English, 11). Lund, Gleerup, 1942. Kr. 10.

STERN, G., Old English *Æ* in the earlier text of Layamon (Goteborgs hogskolas årsskrift, Bd. 47, 24). Goteborg, Wettergren and Kerber, 1941. Kr. 3.

(c) *Modern English.*

BARRIE, J. M., The Letters of, ed. by V. Meynell. London, Davies. 15s.

ELIOT, T. S., Little Gidding. London, Faber and Faber. 1s.

GREG, W. W., The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.

HART, A., Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.

LEWIS, C. S., Hamlet, the Prince or the Poem? Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1942. Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxviii. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.

McKILLOP, A. D., The Background of Thomson's Seasons. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.50.

O'CASEY, S., Red Roses for Me. London, Macmillan. 6s.

PADEN, W. D., Tennyson in Egypt. Lawrence, Kansas, Univ. of Kansas. \$1.50.

PEARSON, H., Bernard Shaw. His Life and Personality. London, Collins. 21s.

TICKELL, R., Anticipation, ed. by L. H. Butterfield. New York, King's Crown Press. \$1.50.

German (Date, unless otherwise stated, 1942).

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

DAHLBERG, T., Studien über den Wortschatz Sudhannovers (Lunds universitets årsskrift, Bd. 37, 6). Lund, Gleerup, 1941. Kr. 8.

JOHNSON, G., Der Lautstand in der Folioausgabe von Hans Sachs' Werken. (Diss.) Uppsala, Appelberg, 1941.

LANG, P., Die Balladik. Geschichte der Balladik, Aesthetik der Ballade, die Ballade im Deutschunterricht. Basel, Helbing und Lichtenhahn. Swiss fr. 3.

LINDQVIST, A., I språkets spegel. Glimtar ur tyskt kultur- och samhällsliv. Stockholm, Bonnier. Kr. 4.50.

WATERHOUSE, G., A Short History of German Literature. London, Methuen. 6s.

(b) *Middle High German.*

WERNER DER GARTENÆRE, Meier Helmbrecht, ed. by Charles E. Gough. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. 6s.

(c) *Middle Low German.*

ARFWIDSSON, A., Zeno oder die Legende von den heiligen drei Königen. Eine mittelniederdeutsche Version. (Lunder germanistische Forschungen, 10.) Lund, Gleerup. 1940. Kr. 12.

(d) *Modern German.*

AKERT, E., Gottfried Kellers Weltanschauung. Seine Stellung zu den Ideen von Gott und Unsterblichkeit. Bern, Mettler und Salz. Swiss fr. 2 85.

BERGER, B., Der moderne deutsche Bildungsroman (Sprache und Dichtung, 69). Bern, Haupt. Swiss fr. 3.50.

CAROSSA, H., Eine Kindheit, ed. by J. Bithell. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. 6s.

FEHR, C., Jeremias Gotthelfs schwarze Spinne als christlicher Mythos. Zurich, Niehans. Swiss fr. 3.20.

FREDÉN, G., Friedrich Menius und das Repertoire der englischen Komodianten in Deutschland. (Diss., Uppsala.) Stockholm, Fritze, 1939. Kr. 10.

HOFFMANN, E. T. A., Der Goldene Topf, ed. by W. F. Mainland. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. 6s. 6d.

HOFMANNSTHAL, HUGO VON, Der Tor und der Tod, ed. by Mary E. Gilbert. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. 3s. 6d.

HÖLDERLIN, F., Gedichte, selected and ed. by A. Closs. London, Duckworth. 6s.

HOLMBERG, O., Thomas Mann och det tredje riket. Stockholm, Bonnier. Kr. 3.75

LANZ, M., Klinger und Shakespeare. (Diss.) Zurich, 1941.

LEANDER, F., Lessing als ästhetischer Denker (Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift, Bd. 48, 3). Göteborg, Wettergren och Kerber. Kr. 5.

MACMURTRIE, D. C., The Gutenberg Documents. New York, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.

SCHREIBER, C. F. (ed. by), Goethe's Works with the exception of *Faust*. A catalogue compiled by the members of the Yale University Library Staff. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s.

SELDEN, E. S., China in German poetry from 1773 to 1833. Berkeley, Cal., Univ of California Press. \$1.75.

SHERRINGTON, Sir CHARLES, Goethe on Nature and on Science. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.

STEINER, H., Der Begriff der Idee im Schaffen Otto Ludwigs (Wege zur Dichtung, 37). Frauenfeld, Huber. Swiss fr. 9.50.

STIRK, S. D., The Prussian Spirit. A survey of German literature and politics, 1914-1940. London, Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

SUMBERG, S. L., The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival (Germanic Studies, New Series, 12). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.

WAAS, G. E., The Legendary Character of Kaiser Maximilian (Germanic Studies, New Series, 14). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.

WAGMAN, F. H., Magic and Science in German Baroque Literature. A study in the prose forms of the later 17th century. (Germanic Studies, New Series, 13.) Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.

AN EARLY VERSION OF MIDDLETON'S
'GAME AT CHESSE'

In 1926 an editor of Thomas Middleton's *Game at Chesse* had to take account of four manuscripts as well as three printed texts. In 1928, while my edition of the play was passing through the press, a fifth manuscript came to light,¹ and more recently a sixth has appeared. I have had the privilege of examining this both before and since it found a permanent home at Washington in the Folger Shakespeare Library, and it fully merits description.

Like all the other manuscripts of the play, the new one is of quarto size. It once belonged to the Irish antiquary Mervyn Archdall (1723-91), whose signature is on the title-page, and an inscription on a fly-leaf states that it was presented by Mrs Mason to Richard Power on 31 January 1815. The manuscript consists of a title-leaf with the title on the recto and 93 numbered pages of text. The book has been cropped by a binder, and occasionally the margins of the text are affected.

The manuscript is in the now familiar hand of Ralph Crane, who was also the scribe of the manuscripts of the play in the British Museum and the Bodleian. The pages of the text are ruled in a style similar to that of Crane's other transcripts of the play, and as in the manuscript of *The Witch* (another of Crane's transcripts) there is a running title.² The text, as in Crane's other manuscripts of the play, is divided into acts and scenes, though there is no scene heading for III, i and a new scene is made to begin after IV, iv, 150. There are a number of corrections in the text in at least three different hands, one of which is probably Middleton's.³

The title-page of the manuscript contains the title on the upper half of the page enclosed within double rules. Unlike the other manuscripts, however, it contains no indication of authorship. Instead, on the lower half of the page, is the date 'August. 13^o./Anno Dñi/1624'. This date is one of the most interesting features of the manuscript, for when it was written the play was still enjoying its brief but sensational run. The first performance was given on 6 August, and on 17 August its career was brought to an end by a peremptory order from the Privy Council. The new manuscript is therefore in all probability the earliest of those which have survived.

The full length of the play (exclusive of prologue and epilogue) is 2154 lines,⁴ but this manuscript, besides omitting the prologue and epilogue, is 277 lines short of the total. The most significant passages omitted are those at II, ii, 1-108, III, i, 1-82 and 321-50; IV, ii, 109-11 and 152-3, IV, iv, 88-91 and 118-19; and V, iii, 197-241. Together these account for 252 out of the 277 lines; the remaining omissions

¹ For a description of this manuscript see 'A New Manuscript of Middleton's *Game at Chesse*', *M.L.R.* xxv (1930), 475-78. This manuscript, like the one described here, is now in the Folger Shakespeare Library, to the authorities of which and to Professor Quincy Adams the author and the editor wish to make grateful acknowledgements.

² For an account of Crane and for facsimiles of pages from the manuscripts referred to, see F. P.

Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', *The Library*, vii (1926), 194-215.

³ 'What haue you there' (II, i, 239), omitted by Crane, is inserted in what seems to be Middleton's hand.

⁴ This count is based on the line numbering of Bullen's edition, since the numbering in my edition recorded manuscript lines, not lines of verse. Otherwise all references are to my edition.

are of brief passages ranging from one to nine lines. It is interesting to note further that, except for two minor omissions (iv, iv, 88-91 and v, iii, 72), none of these coincides with the omissions in MS. Malone 25 (the manuscript of the play in the Bodleian), which presents a much abbreviated version of the play in 1443 lines. The principal effect of the omissions in the new manuscript is to eliminate from the play the characters of the Fat Bishop and his pawn. In any remaining episodes in which the Fat Bishop appeared in the fuller texts, his place is taken by the Black Bishop.

It can be shown, I think, that the version of the play without the Fat Bishop preceded the one in which he is a character, and that the new manuscript is not, like MS. Malone 25, abbreviated from the fuller text. It may be remarked at the outset that the Fat Bishop is not a chessman, and his moves are against all the rules of the game, in fact, with a White Bishop and a Black Bishop already in the play he is an egregious superfluity, and could hardly have belonged to the author's original conception. But such an argument is not conclusive, since Middleton could doubtless have pleaded poetic licence in defence of his creation of the Fat Bishop. More significant is the fact that in the established text the White King addresses the Fat Bishop at iv, v, 94 as 'black holmes'. There seems no serious discrepancy here, since the Fat Bishop has recently crossed over from the white to the black side, but the phrase takes on a different significance when in the new manuscript it is found that the Black Bishop has taken the Fat Bishop's place in this scene, and the phrase is addressed, more appropriately, to him. Finally, at iv, i, 33-6 the Black Bishop's Pawn, unable himself to give absolution, says to the Black Knight's Pawn:

Make youre Petition to the Penance-Chamber,
If the Taxe-Register releue you m't
By the black Bishops clemencie, you haue wrought out
A singular peice of fauour wth youre monie;

but in the following scene the Black Knight and his pawn are in consultation with the Fat Bishop over the pawn's predicament. Once again it is the Black Bishop who appears in this scene in the new manuscript. It would thus appear that these two scenes were originally written for the Black Bishop and not for the Fat Bishop, and that the two references to the Black Bishop are survivals of the earlier version which should have been altered when the Fat Bishop's part was added. The satire on the Archbishop of Spalato was therefore added to the play as an afterthought, and was not part of the original plan. One may, if one chooses, even believe that Middleton added the new character to provide a part for his old friend and collaborator William Rowley, who had recently joined the King's Men,¹ or perhaps that the character of the Fat Bishop was Rowley's own suggestion.

There seems also to have been some alteration in the treatment of the White King's Pawn. Omissions of i, i, 348-53 and iii, i, 303-5 in the new manuscript leave out references to his humble birth and to the fact that he was a member of the White King's council and therefore able by his advice to influence public policy. In the manuscript the passage at i, i, 348 originally read

your knowledge still
Shall proue the richer: and myself your Sword
I dare not longer....

¹ Rowley is known to have played the part of the Fat Bishop; see *T.L.S.* 6 Feb. 1930, p. 102.

but the words 'and myself your Sword' are deleted. Evidently some lines inconsistent with Middleton's changing conception of the character have been omitted. Again, at III, i, 352 the manuscript reads

Oh for the Staff, Sir, the strong Crosier-staff
And the red Hat,

suggesting that more stress had originally been put on the ecclesiastical rewards promised to the White King's Pawn by the Black House. Here the other texts read

Oh for the Staff, the strong Staff that will hold,
And the red Hat.

If the White King's Pawn is the Earl of Middlesex it is difficult enough to believe that an undisciplined public imagination would credit him with having been tempted by a red hat, but the suggestion that he had been influenced by the hope of a bishop's crozier would certainly be straining credulity too far. Bullen conjectured that the White King's Pawn stood for Sir Toby Mathew, and in this one respect at least Sir Toby better fits the part than Middlesex. Someone such as he may well have been the original object of Middleton's satire, but the trial and fall of Middlesex had occurred during the period when the play was being written, and it is not surprising that Middleton should have tried to work him into it, even at the cost of leaving some loose ends.

In several places the stage directions of the new manuscript differ slightly from those in the other texts, and at least two of them throw some light on the way in which the play was produced. The direction at line 53 of the Induction reads 'Musick—En[ter] (seuerally) the Wh[ite] & Black-hous[es] as they are sett f[or] y^e Game',¹ and states more explicitly than any of the other versions that the characters on their first appearance arranged themselves like chessmen on the board. A deleted direction a few lines later (at line 65) reads 'Enter y^e Bl. Q^s. Pawne & Bl. B^{ps}.', but it was probably a mistake of Crane's and due only to a misunderstanding of the text at this point. In II, ii, where the first 108 lines are missing, since they contain an episode in which the Fat Bishop takes part, the opening direction is: 'Enter (seu^rally) wh. King: Q: B^p. Duke. Knight: Pawnes: & Q^s Pawne: and Bl. King, Q. B^p. &c.' The opening of v, i is perhaps the most interesting. Lines 1-9 of the text are absent, and the stage direction was originally written 'Sce^a. pri^a. (Lowd Musick) Enter Bl. King: Queene, Duke, & Pawnes, & Bl. Knight: meeting the white Knight, & Duke: (y^e Bl. B^{ps}. Pawne aboue Entertaines them wth this Lattin Oration).' The single word 'Litter' has been added above the line before 'Enter'. It is known that the players had secured Gondomar's old litter for the performances,² but Middleton could scarcely have been aware that it would be available when he first wrote the play. It looks as if v, i, 1-9 had been added later to provide some dialogue to justify the Black Knight's entrance in his litter, and Crane, though he did not have this piece of dialogue in his copy when he transcribed the manuscript, showed by adding the word 'Litter' to the stage direction that he knew it was used at this point.

Among the textual variants are a number which seem to preserve earlier readings in addition to those which have been already mentioned:

¹ Letters in square brackets have been cropped by the binder.

² Chamberlain to Carleton, 21 Aug. 1624

(*Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure, II, 578).

	New MS.	Other texts
Ind. 26	Vicar Policarpe	parson Policarpe
I, i, 5	daughter of Ignorance ¹	Daughter of heresie
I, i, 32	all the Errors ¹	All the heresies
I, i, 76	there's a litle passage: [Womens poore Arguments make but Wimble holes, The Augur is the Man's. <i>Exit</i>] ²	There's a litle passage made;
I, i, 167	a Puritane well pickled ¹	An Heretique well pickled,
II, i, 186	the Hugonites cheeke	the Lutherans cheeke
II, i, 217	my Litle Jesuitesse ¹	my bouncing Jesuitesse
II, i, 237	the Nunnerie without Temple Bar ¹	the Nunnerie in Drurie Lane
III, ii, 17	the drudgerie and dirty Busynes	the durtie-Drudgerie
IV, i, 3	Litterate-Hatband	letterd hattband
IV, i, 17	the Vnuersall Mark	the Catholicall Marke
IV, ii, 3	my Golden Stoole	my chayre of ease
V, ii, 93	mischeif confound thee ³	A pox confound thee
V, iii, 114	Heere's the mistrie: I tell yo ^u in privat. <i>Bl. K^t</i> . oh: we'are your Cabynetts. <i>Wh. K^t</i> . when I haue . .	heres the miserie, when I haue...
v, iii, 131	you neuer mind me, I shall be shutt- out	You quite forgett mee, I shall bee lockt out

Apart from omissions, variant stage directions, etc., my notes show a total of 110 divergences from the text of my edition which might be called significant. Of these, seventeen, which have already been cited, may be said to preserve earlier readings, and sixteen are probably errors made by Crane in transcribing the play. The remaining seventy-seven are all to be found in some group or individual among the other texts. The new manuscript does not ally itself definitely with any other text or group of texts, but it is, as one might expect, closer to Crane's other transcripts (or texts derived from them) than to the texts with which he was not concerned, and somewhat nearer to the quarto I have designated as III than to the Lansdowne manuscript.

This is as summary an account as possible of an unusually interesting manuscript. The exceptionally large number of surviving manuscripts of the play is due to its political satire and to its suppression on the stage, but the new manuscript offers proof, not previously available, that the play, in spite of the haste with which it was written, underwent revision and enlargement, probably during the period between licencing and performance. Some of Middleton's afterthoughts were no less effective than his original conception had been.

R. C. BALD

ITHACA, NEW YORK

¹ Corrected in the manuscript to the later reading.

² Words in square brackets deleted.

³ Possibly a deliberate alteration by Crane to avoid profanity.

SOUTHEY AND BRAZIL

An article of Gilberto Freyre,¹ 'More about Southey', in the *Correio da Manhã* (21 December 1939), read here in London, was the incentive which led me to pursue the much-needed search in English archives for unpublished documents of Southey on Brazil, a search which neither the Pernambucan writer nor Paulo Prado² had been able to undertake. It was not an opportune moment. The war, upsetting the life of the country, made everything difficult. Military service and the exodus of so many people from London were obstacles to finding a descendant of Southey. Finally I succeeded in communicating with a great-grandson of Warter, the son-in-law of the poet-historian, who kindly put me in touch with his aunt, née Warter, now Mrs F. F. Boulton. She is the niece and heir of the Miss Warter to whom Felix Walter refers in his article on 'The English Lusophiles of the Romantic Age', quoted by Gilberto Freyre, published in French.

I had the opportunity of visiting her and was shown some manuscripts of the poems, letters and remainders of the great library of Southey. These are the papers which Walter mentions as having passed from Warter to his daughter. There were no unpublished documents among them, except a number of notes for the *History of Brazil* and letters, of the greatest interest for us, to John Theodore and Henry Koster.

Southey's library, as we know, sprang from that of his uncle, Herbert Hill, chaplain to the English colony in Lisbon where he lived for 30 years. The Anglican clergyman had collected through dilettantism a splendid library of Portuguese history. To fill the gap in printed matter relating to the eighteenth century, owing to the secrecy maintained by the Portuguese government, he brought together manuscripts copied from convent libraries, from public and private archives, as well as much information of confidential origin. The catalogue of the Southey library does not reveal the existence of important unknown documents. It consists mainly of copies, consequently many of them relate, as was natural, to Portuguese America.

Information of this nature was so difficult to obtain, even for the agents of His Majesty in Lisbon, that Hill recommended Southey to offer it to the Foreign Office, which he did through a friend of Lord Grenville. The Secretary of State replied that the information referred to the 'wrong side of South America' (letter to John May, 29 December 1806). So thus we know that, until the departure of João VI, only the countries of Spanish America interested the British Cabinet.

In October 1800, Southey wrote to John Ruckman that there was a Frenchman in Lisbon studying the history of Brazil, a Frenchman who could not be Beauchamp, who confined himself to plagiarizing his work. In one letter of 29 December 1806 to John May, an Englishman living in Portugal, Southey confesses that there was another person in Europe who possessed as many documents as himself: a certain Abbé du Boys. Everything leads us to believe then that this was the Frenchman to whom he alluded in 1800.

That which Southey's son and son-in-law inherited or the lots which both acquired in the auction of the above-mentioned library only concern his literary production. Both occupied themselves with the biography and the vast correspondence of the poet, edited by them in six and four volumes respectively. Such manuscripts were afterwards scattered, in 1871, on the death of Warter, and in 1889 on that of

¹ Gilberto Freyre, contemporary Brazilian writer from Pernambuco.

² Paulo Prado, contemporary Brazilian writer.

Cuthbert Southey. So the hypothesis framed by Gilberto Freyre on the probability of Southey's having left some unpublished autograph of interest to Brazilians, apart from that already known of the *History of Portugal*, is explained, and shown to be well founded from the research which I carried out on the catalogue of the auction, as we shall see later.

From this catalogue it is clear that, together with the autograph of the *History of Brazil*, there were two volumes in quarto of *Collections* for this work containing, in Southey's own words (letter to Grosvenor Bedford, 31 July 1819), 'a good deal of matter which has not been incorporated, and will therefore be of use hereafter. Whether there will be anyone to value this MS. as an heirloom, God knows. There will, however, be those who would prize it as a bequest. So I would have it dressed like something which is likely to be preserved. You know the value which I attach to this, the greatest of my labours.'

As to the correspondence previously referred to, it consists of fifteen letters written between 1804 and 1811, to John Theodore and, 1815 and 1819, to his son Henry. The former was a merchant established in Liverpool and Lisbon, and the latter the author of one of the best books describing the north-east of Brazil, equally valuable for its iconographic documentation: *Travels in Brazil*.

Knowing the interest which these letters have for us, Mrs Boulton, in return for the esteem accorded to her famous great-grandfather in Brazil, wished to donate them to a Brazilian historical or literary institution. They could not be entrusted to a better qualified body, nor could they be more gratefully accepted than by the *Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, which is to do Southey a befitting homage on the centenary of his death, as to one of their earliest members, as he indeed was.

These letters are eloquent examples of Southey's epistolary talent, of his style, impetuous at times, like a torrent, when he admires contemporary incidents in the Napoleonic drama. They were not included in the collections edited by Cuthbert Southey (1849) and by Warton (1856), either because they treated subjects already discussed in other letters, or because the editors did not receive them in time.

The library and the manuscripts were sold by Sotheby in 1844. In the published catalogue (a copy in which the prices are marked exists in the British Museum) appear the names of those who purchased the various lots. The most important purchaser was the Museum. Of the manuscript part, which primarily interests us, the English section includes 28 lots (among them some of the originals of Southey's lyrics), and the Portuguese and Spanish section 48 lots. Of those relating to Portugal and Brazil, the Museum bought three from the first section and fifteen from the second.

Oliveira Lima,¹ in his *Relação dos Manuscritos portugueses e estrangeiros, de interesse para o Brasil, existentes no Museu Britânico* (Rio de Janeiro, 1903), published in the *Revista do Instituto Histórico*, enumerates barely eight lots, two of which—*Memórias antigas de Portugal* and *Papeis vários políticos*—embrace respectively sixty different pages in folio, out of a total of 1430, and 200 documents of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in nine volumes. These lots were minutely noted by F. F. de la Figanière, in the *Catálogo dos Manuscritos portugueses existentes no Museu Britânico* (Lisbon, 1853). Both contain material concerning Brazil, to which Oliveira Lima called attention following the plan of the Portuguese author. This careful historian admits that among the papers relating to Portugal, Spain and

¹ M. de Oliveira Lima, 1867–1928, Brazilian diplomat and book collector, author of many historical works.

America, references to Brazil had escaped him. He had, however, examined all the volumes which he found mentioned in the catalogues of the British Museum, as he considers that in the same manuscripts studied by Southey data and information are given which have not yet been discovered and which should be known. Oliveira Lima concludes, in the preface to his work, that the Museum is an extraordinarily abundant source, still far from having been fully exploited.

In the *Papeis políticos* (collected by Mathias Pinheiro), to which indexes are to be found in Figanhière, among others on Maranhão and the expulsion of the Jesuits, figure some of Alexandre¹ and Bartholomeu² de Gusmão, including a sketch of the *Maquina de andar pelo ar* with its accompanying explanation.

The Museum did not acquire the manuscript of the *Guerra Civil ou sedições de Pernambuco, exemplo memorável aos vindouros* (1711), a copy of one of the contemporary chronicles of the War of the Mascates, sent to Southey by Henry Koster from Pernambuco (the catalogue does not reveal the identity of the purchaser). Nor were the following acquired: the *Coleção Sumária das Leis, Cartas Regias, Avisos e Ordens da Secretaria do Govêrno da Capitania das Minas Gerais* (Villa Rica, 1774), the *Methodo que parece ao Ouvidor Superintendente das Terras e Aguas da Comarca de Villa Rica para se formar o Regimento Geral para as repartições dos descobrimentos novos e antigos e . . . do uso de minerar*, by Augusto Leitão, nor various *Memorias* relating to the Captaincy of Minas Gerais, to the diamond contracts (Gomes Freire de Andrada, 1740), to the collection of the *quintos* and the tobacco contract. The first two were bought by the bookseller Thorpe, one of the agents of the great collector Sir Thomas Phillipps, and the *Memoirs* by one Wheatley. Thorpe also acquired the original manuscript of the *History of Brazil* and the above-mentioned *Collections* uniformly bound.

According to the description of the catalogue which the bookseller published in the year of the sale (London, 1844), and in which both the *History* and the *Collections* were offered in one lot for £45, these *Collections* contain much unpublished material and variants of the text; it is added that 'the sources whence the materials were obtained are invariably noted and the cancelled or doubtful matter left readable'.

I was not able to discover the two manuscripts in the list of the thousands which composed Phillipps's famous library, but this does not completely exclude the hypothesis, since the same catalogue is not in either chronological or alphabetical order, nor has it any index to facilitate research.

What befell the *Collections*? They are not to be found in the British Museum, nor in the Bodleian, the two great libraries rich in Portuguese books and manuscripts, nor in Bristol, Southey's birthplace, where the unpublished *Diary* of his second stay in Portugal is to be found, nor in the small museum at Keswick. Neither do they appear in any of the most notable English private collections. Canon Maurice H. FitzGerald, editor of Southey's poetical works, Mrs Boulton and Mr J. Simmons of Oxford, who is writing a new biography of Southey, could not offer any further information. Most probably they are in the United States, whither many treasures of English literature have emigrated.

Would they form the *Critical Account of all the Documents, printed or in manuscript* which Southey intended to include in the appendix to the last volume of his *History of Brazil*, as he remarks in the preface, but which he omitted so as not to

¹ Alexandre de Gusmão, 1695-1753, Secretary of State to King João V of Portugal.

² Bartholomeu de Gusmão, 1685-1724, priest,

mathematician and the first man to rise in a balloon (on 5 Aug 1709 at Lisbon). The two brothers were born in Santos, Brazil.

lengthen the work unduly? He left it aside to constitute, with the Portuguese history series, a *Biblioteca Histórico Lusitana*. The fact that these manuscripts were included among those in English at the sale seems to refute the hypothesis that it is a question of a collection of truly original documents of which the greater part would be in Portuguese. As the two lots (the *History* and the *Collections*) appear consecutively in the catalogue, it may be supposed that one complements the other. Southey, in a letter to H. Koster, says that the manuscript of the whole work was bound in five volumes, which corroborates such a supposition. So the disappearance of this critical appreciation of the sources does not imply the loss of documents. It is a pity, however, that it should not have come to light as it would have been the first Brazilian historical bibliography, containing very precious information, much more complete and valuable than the essay compiled by Beauchamp, the unceremonious plagiarist of the marginal notes to the *History of Brazil*, since, as Southey wrote to John May (27 January 1807), it contained biographical and critical data on the authors.

Almost as deep a mystery surrounds the whereabouts of the unpublished manuscripts of the *History of Portugal*. Southey worked at it enthusiastically at different times for more than twenty years. In the words of the author, it would be, by the beauty and variety of the material, more pleasing than any other existing work on the subject—it became, moreover, the cause of his deep melancholy when he realized that he would not live long enough to finish it. Southey's admirers often interested themselves in the destiny of this manuscript which seemed to have disappeared. It was not sold at the auction. It fell to Edith May Warter, the eldest daughter, from the property left by the Poet Laureate. It is not known to whom it passed after the deaths of the Warters. Canon FitzGerald hunted vainly for it in English public and private libraries. Oliveira Lima, one of the few Brazilians who has written on Southey, in his monograph on the poet (Tokio, 1902), mentions that he had actually seen dozens of the notebooks; but they were only the notes in which Southey 'collected the material for the history of the Portuguese in Europe, Africa and Asia, which remained only a plan, despite all the road travelled towards its realization' (*Revista do Instituto Histórico*, p. 236, 1905). In 1901 however the manuscript appeared in a catalogue of the bookseller Sotheran of London, it was bought by Mr Archer Huntington, founder of the Hispanic Society of America, who, in April 1902, replied in answer to the inquiry of Dr Richard Garnett (author of the article on Southey in the *Dictionary of National Biography*) that he was ready to publish the manuscript if it were suitable. According to the description in the catalogue the manuscript sold by Sotheran does not seem to contain the whole work, since, in letters of 1804, Southey announces that he has ready three volumes in quarto of 500 pages each, and in 1805 writes that the work is practically finished, only awaiting the return of his uncle Hill to obtain indispensable data, for which he was still hunting in Portugal. The manuscript sold by Sotheran only contains 550 pages in small writing, certainly embracing the period 1063–1583 which Southey had reached. This is perhaps the reason of its not being published by the Hispanic Society. Possibly it is now in the library of this society in New York, as the librarian admitted when I asked him for information, but it may alternatively still be in the possession of Dr Huntington who jealously guards many of his precious manuscripts.

There is no mention either of the 'Wondrous Collection' of material for the *History of Portugal*, of which Warter speaks (preface to the *Common-Place Book* of Southey, 42nd series) and to which Oliveira Lima had access.

Writing to Miss Seton (3 June 1804) Southey said that the work would be divided into three volumes on Europe, Asia and Africa, two or three volumes on the conquests in Asia, and one volume on Brazil.

He still intended to dedicate two volumes to the literary history of the peninsula and another to the introduction and progress of Christianity in Japan, as well as writing a description of Portugal to complete the cycle, thus leaving to the world the most vast description ever attempted of any country. He counted on illustrating the last part with drawings by Miss Seton, whose talent he admired and whom he had met in Lisbon.

The correspondence with the two Kesters begins in 1804 when Southey had just established himself at Keswick. The first seven letters are written to the father and the other eight to the author of *Travels in Brazil*, who was first in Liverpool, then in Pernambuco.

The letters to John Theodore dealt principally with politics, home and foreign. In them, with his usual expansiveness, he pours out somewhat intolerant opinions on his contemporaries and generally pessimistic views on national questions. The problems which England faced in that acute phase of the continental war, after the Peace of Amiens, are very similar in many ways to those of to-day, and there are many parallels between that war and this, even if the order of the campaigns is reversed (the Russian preceding the Egyptian). The vehement comments and invectives of Southey could be repeated to-day. From these letters, as from so many others to other correspondents, certain topics stand out which might have been written to-day—the unpopularity of the French in Italy, the danger of invasion, a false alarm on the coast. The existence of volunteers in the neighbourhood, the body from which the Home Guard has recently sprung, provokes his irony. He comments on special precautions in the sending of books by ships in convoy, and the loss of two cargoes, since the beginning of the war. He also displays the confidence which marks the citizen of to-day, in the certainty of failure of any attempt to land enemy troops and the same longing for the attempt to be made so that peace may come the quicker. He speculates on the value of gold and on its relation to prices, in short, on many topics current to-day. The testimony of a contemporary who thrilled with the great problems of the day, sharing the hopes and fears of those critical times, naturally remains of lively interest.

The letters to Henry affect us more closely, as they deal with points bearing on our history and on books by English authors on Brazil.

Henry Kester, as we know, sailed for Recife at the end of 1809. He was born in Lisbon and spoke Portuguese as well as English. Delicate health did not permit him to live in England. The occupation of Portugal by Junot made Lisbon inaccessible. He sought, therefore, the more amenable climate of Pernambuco. From Recife he went to Fortaleza. He returned to Pernambuco and sailed for England the following year, stopping on the way at Maranhão. The approach of winter, a longing for sunshine, took him to Pernambuco again in 1811. He became a sugar planter in Jaguaribe and then in Itamaracá. His father's death obliged him to go to England in 1815, where he remained until the end of 1816. The dates of Southey's letters enable us to fix the time of this stay. He returned to Recife. In 1820, when he was living in Goiana, he died of tuberculosis. He lived for nine years in all in Brazil. He identified himself so completely with that country that even his name was naturalized to Henrique Costa.

In the volumes of *Selected Letters* of Southey there are frequent references to Kester whom he had known in Lisbon in 1800, and who was his companion in 1815

in an excursion to Flanders. He was a companion to his heart's content, as Southey writes in *The Poet's Pilgrimage to Waterloo*:

...who from the Land of Lakes with me
Went out upon this pleasant pilgrimage,
Had sojourn'd long beyond the Atlantic sea;
Adventurous was his spirit as his age,
For he in far Brazil, through wood and waste,
Had travell'd many a day, and there his heart was placed.
Wild region...happy if at night he found
The shelter of some rude Tapuya's shed,
Else would he take his lodgement on the ground,
Or from the tree suspend his hardy bed;
And sometimes, starting at the jaguar's cries,
See through the murky night the prowler's fiery eyes,
And sometimes over thirsty deserts drear,
And sometimes over flooded plains he went,
A joy it was his fire-side tales to hear,
And he a comrade to my heart's content.

In the *Quarterly Review* Southey reviews his friend's book in which he collaborated. The quarto edition of 1816 was quickly exhausted, since in August 1817 only ten copies remained and a second edition in octavo was in preparation, which was to appear at almost the same time as the translation (Paris, 1818). According to an undated letter, Koster was preparing a second part. What was to happen to this manuscript which was sent to Southey? It is not known whether it was entrusted to the firm which published the first part, since, in 1890, the autographs and correspondence, which were in their archives and had been partly destroyed by fire in 1860, were examined.

Did Southey return it to Koster in Pernambuco?

Koster wished to translate the *History of Brazil* and actually began. Southey accepted the proposal, though he did not consider himself competent to appreciate what the other had submitted. He remarked that verbal correction was not all. One might say that Southey did not judge Koster to be the translator whom he would have preferred, and immediately afterwards gave him an obvious piece of advice, in the event of his persevering in his design, which was to retain the original quotations, so that the text might have the native raciness which the English lacked. There is perhaps in this remark a note of distrust. Who knows whether this was the reason why Koster did not continue?

In his last letters Southey pays tribute to Koster's contribution to the *History of Brazil*, particularly in the third volume: 'you will see your own name very often in the margin' (letter of 16 November 1819). He laments, in one of them, the arrival of some of the letters too late to be included in the work, on the completion of which he congratulates himself to his correspondent. 'the most laborious history in our language'. In another he repeats 'the greatest labour of my life'.

The *leitmotiv* of a correspondence covering four years, which Southey was unwilling to lose sight of—the 'old subject', dear to his heart—were the topics of the *History of Brazil*. The bequeathing of it to a Brazilian institution is a gesture for which we are grateful and which Southey would have approved.

The acute critical sense and historical intuition of which Southey had given proof in his biographies and historico-literary essays are confirmed. For instance, his observations on the reward with which Fernandes Vieira¹ was despatched to

¹ J. Fernandes Vieira, one of the leaders of the Pernambucan revolution against the Dutch, hero of two contemporary chronicles *Castruoto Lus-*

tano (Raphael de Jesus) and *Valeroso Lucideno* (M. Calado).

Angola. He seems already to have had doubts as to who was the real hero of the Pernambucan reconquest, and foreshadows Varnhagen¹ in the judgement which destroys the legend of the *Castrioto Lusitano* and the *Valeroso Lucideno* in favour of Vidal de Negreiros.

Southey was also the first to discover the importance of the *History* of Frei Vicente Salvador, whom he knew solely through the *Santuário Mariana* (a work long awaited from Portugal, which arrived too late to be of use to him in his third volume). Surprised by the reference which he read there for the first time, he does not confuse him with Frei Manoel do Salvador (Calado). he asks Koster if he can give him further information on the subject. As we know, it was Varnhagen who discovered the manuscript of this work in the library of the *Palácio das Necessidades* and only examined it perfunctorily.

Affirming what all the English and American travellers were to write later about Belem, a city destined by its geographical position to be a more important commercial centre than Recife, he foresaw what facts are confirming, if not from the point of view of commerce, from that of strategy, in the present emergency, that the two ports, occupying key positions, are both destined to develop without one overshadowing the other.

Southey, as was natural, gained the reputation in England of being an authority on Portuguese-Brazilian subjects. If anyone ventured to publish something on the two countries, he hastened first to ask Southey's advice. To his persuasion apparently we owe the *Notes on Rio de Janeiro* of John Luccock (1820), which, according to the judgement of a contemporary, Sir Charles (afterwards Lord) Stuart, in a letter (now in the archives of Highcliffe Castle) from Rio to his wife, was the best description of the country in existence, praises which he did not accord Maria Graham, although he admired her sketches. Luccock is the person who wrote to Southey, from Leeds, about the publication of a Tupí grammar (27 November 1818). Henderson was another to ask his opinion on his *History of Brazil*. Koster therefore was not the only one to ask his advice.

Southey's preference for history was marked. He was outstanding as a prose writer rather than as a poet, though what was to be his chief work—the *History of Portugal*—was left unfinished. As a biographer his style captivates and enchants: careful and critical, clear and pleasant in narrative. Works like the *Life of Nelson* and the *Life of Wesley* will always be read with admiration. But where Southey excels as man and writer is in his letters, in which he stands revealed a master in easy and familiar composition. His letters are more and more a mine of precious information, both literary and biographical. Thackeray, in *The Four Georges*, says that the letters 'are worth piles of epics, and are sure to last among us as long as kind hearts like to sympathize with goodness and purity, and love and upright life'. The heroic temper of the man, his inflexible sense of duty, his independence and generosity, shown in his adoption of the Coleridge family, are seen to a greater extent in his letters than in any other of the literary forms he cultivated. As FitzGerald observes in his preface to *Selected Letters* (1912): 'just because Southey's letters reveal his true character, they reveal it in its weakness as well as in its strength.' A warm admirer of the French Revolution at first, his opinions changed as the ugly side of the revolution revealed itself and he became a reactionary on the question of Parliamentary reform and a strong opponent to Catholic emancipation, the two great polemics of his day.

Students of Southey are surprised that he should have carried on only the

¹ A. Varnhagen, 1816-78, notable Brazilian historian (Viscount of Porto Seguro).

Brazilian part of the *History of Portugal*, since the subject would be of less interest to the English public. Southey seems to have divined the reproach. In a letter to H. Koster (27 November 1818) he asserts that he does not regret the time and labour spent on the work, claiming that no one could have been better suited to the task: an Englishman would not have had the sympathy for the language and sentiments of the Portuguese, which he had acquired in long intercourse with the literature and history of Portugal; neither would a Portuguese or Brazilian of his time possess the necessary impartiality and independence, although he would have had a better knowledge of his people. It was his conviction that 'it will . . . communicate to the Brazilians, when they have become a powerful nation, much of their history which would otherwise have perished. It will be to them what the work of Herodotus is to Europe' (Letter to Chauncey Townsend, July 1819).

Since so many points on the origins of our history still remain obscure, owing to the loss of the chronicles of Barros and Faria y Sousa, which refer to Portuguese America, as Cazal¹ claims, and, as Capistrano² adds, the lack of information on the work of the Jesuits, the importance is increased of the conscientious work of compilation and criticism which Southey, unable, as he himself laments, to gain access to archives, carried out from such unreliable and contradictory sources. He was ousted from his supremacy by Varnhagen, forty years later, and since the organization and opening up of European archives, in the nineteenth century, made the methodic study of sources possible for the historian.

Proof of the conscientiousness with which Southey played his part as a historian is found in a letter to Wordsworth's son-in-law, in which he mentions having asked Sir Egerton to find out whether there really existed in the Zürich library a history of Brazil in manuscript, since, in that case, he would have to go there when he could.

That a foreigner, who had never been to Brazil, should have succeeded in writing a *History* with such great critical sense and with so true a sense of perspective, lacking any model to guide him, already entitles him to the respect of Brazilians of all time for his herculean labours as a pioneer, even if the understanding, almost the partiality, with which he related the struggles of our people against the French, Dutch, and even Portuguese did not ensure him our gratitude.

But what reason prompted Southey to execute only this part of his grandiose project, in preference to the heroic period of the formation of the Portuguese people and to the epic of the discoveries, either of which offer more material to one of the greatest prose writers in the English language?

We know that Southey was never well-off; he had to provide for a numerous family from his writings. Apart from a small state pension which totalled the sum of £300 when he became Poet Laureate (1813), he lived by his pen. Only in 1835, at the end of his life, an additional £300 brought him independence and peace of mind.

He had no illusions concerning the number of copies he would sell, besides those which would go to public libraries, nor of the number of readers he would have—some fifty in England, a half-dozen in Portugal and Brazil.

Eight years after the publication of the first volume, he had received less than what he would have been paid for a single article in the *Quarterly Review*, as he confesses in a letter to John Taylor Coleridge.

Southey relates that he would receive at the most £100 for the second volume, only half of what he would be paid for a preface (which however does not seem to have

¹ Ayres de Cazal, 1774–1824? Portuguese priest and author.

² Capistrano de Abreu, 1853–1927, Brazilian historian.

been confirmed), 'a preposterous instance of the caprice upon which a man of letters depends. Ridiculous that I should derive my main support from what other persons might do as well and what might as well not be done at all; while for works of value and labour, for which peculiar knowledge, talents and industry are required, the profit would not amount to the expense of the documents' (Letter to John May, 18 October 1816).

It was his desire also to write a *History of the Monastic Orders*. Was he tempted by the work of the Jesuits in America? However, not even his admiration for the great preachers Nobrega and Anchieta, or for the missionary activities of the Jesuits in Brazil and Paraguay, could entirely overcome his hatred for the bigoted fanaticism of the time.

Waterton (*Wanderings in South America*—Second Journey, chapter 1) did not ignore Southey's acrimony against the fanatical zeal and the calculated policy of the Society of Jesus, and put posthumously into the mouth of Nobrega curses against the 'ungrateful Englishman' who accuses the Society of idolatry, without understanding the system which it founded and which brought great advantages to Brazil. This remark of the English traveller is unjust, however. In a letter to Koster, Southey asks what the opinion of the Brazilians is on the expulsion of the Jesuits, which had been 'in every way impolitic as well as abominably unjust'.

Maria Graham (*Journal of a Voyage to Brazil*, p. 13) attributes the lack of popularity which befell the *History of Brazil* among us to the intolerant language of the author on subjects of conscience, which humanity always faces in so intransigent a manner. The famous authoress deplores Southey's forgetfulness of the quotation which he himself brings forward from Jeremy Taylor: 'Zeal against an error is not always the best instrument to find out truth.' Anglican by conviction, Southey never freed himself from his prejudices against the superstition and bigoted clericalism of the day.

The lack of success of the work in Brazil cannot be attributed to this one reason. English was far from being then a familiar language to the Portuguese at home and overseas. The luxury of the edition, the monopoly of Portuguese books, were other obstacles. And if we consider what little reading was done then in Brazil, and the scarcity of bookshops upon which all visitors to the country remark, it is not surprising that it should be so. When at length, in 1862, the translation of Fernandes Pinheiro appeared, the work of Varnhagen (1st ed. 1854), which brought to light new documents of Torre do Tombo and obscured Southey's fame as a pioneer, had already been published.

If Koster's contemporary translation had appeared, expurgated of any elements which would have seemed heretical, and of excessive liberalism, as Southey himself advised in the letter of 3 June 1815, the book would have certainly been well received, since 'the general tone of the work is much in favour of the Portuguese: for the long attention which I have given to their history and the whole of their literature has given me a sort of intellectual naturalization among them; and when the needful castrations were made neither the Government nor the people will have any cause to be offended with the disposition of the writer'.

Another explanation, doubtless more probable, for Southey's preference, is to be sought in the times he lived in. There is not the slightest doubt that the departure of the Portuguese Court to the New World, with the subsequent throwing open of the ports, freeing Brazil for international trade, aroused the greatest curiosity in England and in Europe. The appearance of so many travel books, the success of Koster's book, the rich edition of Chamberlain's *Views and Costumes of Rio* prove this amply.

The 'pantisocrats' Southey and Coleridge, who had barely left the Universities before the outbreak of the Great Revolution, planned to emigrate to America, where they wanted to form a sentimental and primitive community, to cultivate pastoral virtues and the refinements of culture. From that time on Southey was interested in the American Indians. His romantic imagination, influenced by Rousseau, was fascinated by the magic of strange native names and the novelty of the scenery. Southey is the poet of exotic mythology: *Thalaba*, *Kehama*, *Madoc*. Already attracted by knight errantry, the Cid, Amadis and Palmerin, he found it easy to pass from the peninsular setting of battles for the faith, between Moors and Christians, to the conquering of the South American jungles by the *bandeirantes*, the semi-religious struggles between Brazilians, French and Dutch.

He also found it a relief from the preoccupations of the Napoleonic war, as he confesses to J. T. Koster (5 December 1808). He was more fascinated by the wars of the Dutch in Brazil, and by the *Tapuias* and *Tupinambás*, than by the Swedes and Russians, and this when Bonaparte was on the point of entering Madrid and was threatening Lisbon. In another letter (28 December 1815) he said he was taking a holiday from his labours on the *Poet's Pilgrimage to La Belle Alliance* (one of the *corvées* imposed on him by the post of Laureate) among the *Guaranis* and the Jesuits.

The first volume of the *History of Brazil* appeared while the Peninsular War was raging. Announcing the sending of this volume to the elder Koster, Southey's enthusiasm was aroused by the Iberian reaction against the invader, adding his old admiration for Portugal to his hate for Bonaparte, and remarking that 'our poor friends the Portuguese whom everybody had thought himself privileged to look upon with contempt, should be the first people to set an example of beating the French upon their own ground'.

According to his published correspondence, Southey began work on the *History of Brazil* during the years 1805-6. Writing to John Rickmann (23 December 1806) he explained 'the times being South America mad, any account of Brazil, instead of being the last work in the series, must be the first'.

Up to the re-editing of the first volume in 1822, Southey worked at it continuously and intensely. During the interval between the appearance of the second and third volumes, the editor found it necessary to re-issue the first volume, which by then was out of print. Southey was delighted to have an opportunity of including new material derived from the letters of D. Luiz de Souza and from the books of Jabotão and Calado. As he wrote to his uncle Hill (18 February 1820), he would also be able to insert the letter of Pero Vaz Caminha,¹ the authenticity of which he was at first inclined to doubt, when he read it in the *Corografia Brazilica*, owing to the words *sertões* and *inhame*, which he thought were Brazilianisms, the latter from Tupi, but afterwards found them to be current in Portuguese Africa.

In his retreat, among the English Lakes, where, in 1803 he and his wife had joined Mrs Coleridge (sister of Mrs Southey) to recover from the loss of their first child, Southey was able to collect together the books that had been accumulating since his journeys to Portugal. At Keswick, when finally, in 1807, after much hesitation, he understood that there he would remain for the rest of his life, giving up his plans of a Consulate in Lisbon and of a house in Cintra, the paradise of his dreams, he prepared the house for the installation of his many folios and the fair-sized library of his uncle.

Neither porcelain, marble, furniture nor pictures inspired in him the collector's passion which he bestowed on books, a love without bounds or moderation. He

¹ Pero Vaz Caminha, narrator of Cabral's voyage which discovered Brazil in 1500.

continued to receive them by coach from London. He never made an excursion to the Continent that was not preceded or followed by enormous packages. Milan, Paris, Brussels, Amsterdam, all contributed to fill his shelves. He sacrificed many things to satisfy his passion: clothes, pleasures, comfort. 'De Quincey called Southey's library his wife, and in a certain sense it was wife and mistress and mother to him', quotes his biographer Edward Dowden, who further relates that, in his hours of weakness, when he could no longer read his books, he caressed and pressed them to his lips. The London booksellers 'knew the tall figure, the rapid stride, the quick-seeking eyes, the eager fingers' (English Men of Letters Series, p. 104).

The four thousand volumes which he first brought with him multiplied every year: eight, ten, fourteen thousand volumes which made up the 5000 lots of his auction.

Southey writes to his old friend Bedford: 'to see such a display of literary wealth, which is at once the pride of my eye, and the joy of my heart, and the food of my mind, indeed, more than metaphorically, meat, drink and clothes for me and mine. I verily believe that no one... was ever so rich before...'. He even turned book-binder. Elsewhere he repeats: old friends and old books were to him the best things that life could offer. His pleasure came not only from looking at his books, but from handling them. Southey devoured books. He read them extraordinarily quickly, marking the pages, noting the passages which might interest him or copying them on to small pieces of paper which he numbered and clipped together in order of subject. That was his method of digesting authors. He did it systematically. It was a way of resting between periods of creative activity. 'I am for ever making collections and storing up materials which may not come into use till the Greek Callends', he confessed.

Southey's collection of Spanish and Portuguese books, excepting that of Lord Stuart of Rothesay, was the richest private collection in England. Like Stuart, Minister to Portugal during the Peninsular War and Ambassador in Paris after Waterloo, his uncle and he secured many of their treasures from the dispersal of private and convent libraries, in an age of wars and revolutions. Other books he owed to the generosity of admirers; the Conde dos Arcos, for example, who withdrew from the library at Bahia a duplicate copy of Anchieta's *Guarani Grammar*, the loan of which Southey had requested from his readers in the Introduction to his first volume. In a letter to John Theodore he announces the birth of his son Herbert: 'heir apparent to more Portuguese books perhaps than anyone not a subject of Portugal.'

Ticknor, writing to Pascual de Gayangos from the United States, says that he sought to enrich his Spanish library with books from the Southey sale and to this end gave instructions to his friend and countryman, Obadiah Rich, another learned bibliophile, to devote the entire sum he was sending him to Southey books. Although he secured those which interested him most, he regretted not having bought all he could, because Rich had acted in too parsimonious a manner.

I have already mentioned the fact that the greater part of the manuscripts were acquired by the British Museum. Many Portuguese and Spanish books from this sale went also to the same shelves, as the Sale Catalogue shows, where the name of the intermediary Rodd frequently appears by the side of the rarer specimens, disputing them with Thorpe and Rich. Many of those of Brazilian interest are there to-day.

J. DE SOUSA-LEÃO

THE WELSH INFLUENCE IN THE POETRY OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS

Hopkins was always peculiarly responsive to the 'instress and charm of Wales',¹ and it is not surprising that he should have found a study of her poetry attractive and rewarding. As a poet, he has much in common with the outstanding Welsh poets of every age (for Welsh poetry has always been dominated by tradition, and the various stages of its development in the course of over a thousand years are connected by peculiar qualities which are common to all). The Welsh poetic genius, like his own, is lyrical, and is distinguished by its care for form. Hopkins's admiration for formal perfection is implicit in many of his remarks on literature, and is expressed precisely in a sentence from his notes on 'Poetry and Verse' (? 1873-4). 'Poetry is speech framed for contemplation of the mind by the way of hearing or speech framed to be heard *for its own sake even over and above its interest of meaning*.'² And it might be said of Welsh poetry that the hearer's attention is too often usurped by the mere external details of the form, it is, as Hopkins said of one of his own poems, 'in point of execution very highly wrought',³ for, like him, Welsh poets have welcomed the discipline of a highly exacting metrical form. Not many Englishmen, perhaps, would admire and wish to imitate the device of *cynghanedd*, with its complicated system of alliteration and internal rhyme, on a first examination of the elaborate and rigid rules of *cynghanedd*, it might seem impossible that any poet could ever achieve a mastery of such a metre without sacrificing the more essential elements of his poetry. But not only is Welsh verse unsurpassed, as Hopkins noted, in beauty of sound; the technical demands made on the poet have obliged him to neglect no detail of his work, to refine and polish it in an effort to attain a consummate perfection of expression; and they have encouraged him to eliminate colourless and unnecessary words, and so to cultivate the epigrammatic concentration which is a feature of so much Welsh poetry. The requirements of *cynghanedd* have often had a salutary effect on the poet's vocabulary, preventing him from being too conservative in his choice of words, and stimulating him to coin new words of his own.

Although the references to Welsh and Welsh poetry in Hopkins's letters and papers are neither numerous nor explicit, it is not difficult to trace from them the development of his interest in Welsh. In August 1874, he went to St Beuno's, North Wales, to study theology, and little more than a week after his arrival, he noted in his journal that he had begun to learn Welsh, but had given it up because he felt that he was not actuated solely by zeal for the conversion of the natives. This seems to indicate that Hopkins's decision to learn Welsh was prompted by an interest in literary questions, and since it was made so soon after he came to St Beuno's, it is possible that he had already heard something about the peculiarities of Welsh prosody—perhaps during the preparation of his lectures in rhetoric at Roehampton, in the months immediately preceding his residence in Wales—and that he welcomed the opportunity to study the subject at first hand. Subsequently he was able to resume his studies, and early in 1876 he wrote 'The Wreck of the Deutschland', his first poem since he became a Jesuit in 1868; this, as he later told R. W. Dixon,

¹ *The Note-Books and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Humphry House, Oxford, 1937 (N.), p. 210.

² N. p. 249 (italics mine).

³ *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges*, ed. C. C. Abbott, London, 1935 (L.R.B.), p. 274.

included among its many 'oddnesses' 'certain chimes suggested by the Welsh poetry I had been reading (what they call *cynghanedd*)...'.¹ From the infrequent references to Welsh in his letters to friends, it appears that he was occasionally discouraged by the difficulty of the language, and especially of the poetry, but on 3 April 1877, he wrote to Robert Bridges with reference to 'two sonnets' ('God's Grandeur' and 'The Starlight Night?'), 'The chiming of consonants I got in part from the Welsh, which is very rich in sound and imagery'.² In the following June he wrote to Dr John Rhŷs, who in October of that year became the first Professor of Celtic at Oxford; of the subsequent correspondence only Rhŷs's side remains, but his letters, in which he comments on suggestions made by Hopkins with regard to Welsh grammar, literature, and phonetics, indicate that Hopkins was a curious and enthusiastic student of Welsh.

After his departure from Wales in October 1877, the references to Welsh in Hopkins's letters become even more rare, and by 1882 he apparently believed that Welsh poetry had ceased to influence him directly, for in that year he wrote to Bridges of 'The Sea and the Skylark' (May 1877): 'It was written in my salad days, in my Welsh days, when I was fascinated with *cynghanedd* or consonant chime, and as in Welsh *englyn*s, "the sense", as one of themselves said, "gets the worst of it"...'.³ At the same time this is so strongly worded—'my Welsh days', 'fascinated'—as to imply that the influence was at one time considerable. That he maintained an active interest in Welsh during the last years of his life is shown by a long letter from Sir John Rhŷs, dated 24 April 1886, which refers to a theory advanced by Hopkins regarding the derivation of the *englyn*. During his last visit to Wales, in the autumn of 1886, Hopkins's flagging inspiration revived, and he wrote to Bridges: 'Some scenes of my *Winefred* have been taking shape here in Wales, always to me a mother of Muses'.⁴

From the published letters and notebooks we know nothing of the Welsh poetry which Hopkins studied, except that it was certainly in the 'classical' tradition, as it contained *cynghanedd*; there are no precise clues, such as a reference to any poet or period. So far, the documentary evidence is tantalizingly suggestive and indefinite, but a most important contribution to our information has been made by Mr W. H. Gardner, who recently discovered a copy of a Welsh *cywydd* in Hopkins's own handwriting.⁵ Mr Gardner cites both internal and external evidence which would seem to prove that this was composed by Hopkins himself; it is dated 24 April 1876, and was thus written shortly after 'The Wreck of the Deutschland'. Though there are mistakes in the language, and the *cynghanedd* is for the most part merely rudimentary, it shows an understanding of the *cywydd* form which indicates that at that time Hopkins had a considerable knowledge of Welsh and had made a serious study of Welsh poetry.

We have Hopkins's own admission that he was appreciably influenced by his reading of Welsh verse, but it is not easy to determine the possible extent of that

¹ *The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and R. W. Dixon*, ed. C. C. Abbott, London, 1935, p. 15.

² *L.R.B.* p. 38. The remark on imagery suggests that Hopkins may have had in mind the technique of *dyfalu*, describing something by means of a series of fanciful metaphorical comparisons, which is common in the work of the later medieval and early modern Welsh poets, and which is employed by Hopkins in 'The Starlight Night'. But the method is anticipated in

an entry in one of his early diaries (1864):

• 'The sky minted into golden sequins,
Stars like gold tufts.
— — golden bees.
— — golden rowels.

...Stars like tiny-spoked wheels of fire...'
(*N.* p. 32).

³ *L.R.B.* p. 163. ⁴ *Ibid.* p. 227.

⁵ Vide W. H. Gardner, 'G. Manley Hopkins as a *Cywyddwr*', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1940, pp. 184 ff.

influence.' An examination of the peculiarities of his diction, and of his uses of alliteration and rhyme, may provide at least a partial solution to the problem.

Hopkins's style at its most characteristic has several features in common with that of Welsh poetry in the classical tradition, which is essentially economical, impressionistic, concrete. Like Hopkins, the Welsh poet 'needed . . . all his space for his poetical words, and he wished to crowd out every merely grammatical colourless or toneless element'.¹ The article and the relative are frequently omitted, as they are in Hopkins's poetry, and Welsh poets have always been sparing in their use of the finite verb. Early Welsh nature poetry is distinguished from the contemporary Irish poetry by its sketchy phrasing and in particular by its omission of the verb; its brief descriptive sentences are noun clauses, as in

Llym awel; llwm bryn; anhawdd caffael clyd,

'cutting (is the) wind; bare (is the) hill; difficult (is it) to find shelter',² and the usage has been retained in Welsh poetry up to modern times. It sometimes appears in Hopkins's work; as Welsh poets occasionally proceed for lines without using a verb, indicating the thought by a succession of nouns and adjectives, so Hopkins will sketch in a natural scene:

The blue wheat-acre is underneath
And the braided ear breaks out of the sheath,
The ear in milk, lush the sash,
And crush-silk poppies aflash,
The blood-gush blade-gash
Flame-rash rudred
Bud shelling or broad-shed
Tatter-tassel-tangled or dingle-a-dangled
Dandy-hung dainty head.

(64)³

The compression of Welsh poetic diction is achieved partly by an extensive use of compound words; these in many cases express a thought that could otherwise be represented only by a complete clause. The frequent occurrence of compound words in the work of the medieval poets is one of the chief causes of their obscurity: in an elegy by Gruffudd ap Maredudd, for instance, the subject is described as 'eurgledd aerglo lluruglas',⁴ 'gold-sword battle-close blue-armour', which has to be expanded in the reader's mind into 'one having a golden sword, in a blue coat of mail, who brought battles to an end'.

The youthfully luxuriant style of Hopkins's 'A Vision of the Mermaids' abounds in such compounds as 'pansy-dark', 'dainty-delicate', 'crimson-golden': a much greater restraint is perceptible in the diction of the 'Early Poems', where, however, 'feel-of-primrose' and to a lesser degree 'lovely-dumb' anticipate the later compounds. The language of the 'Deutschland' and succeeding poems is rich in individual and pregnant compound words, and Hopkins continued to employ them freely to the last. It is obvious that his was a mind which instinctively sought to express itself by means of compounds, and that he had a genius for their formation. But it is at least possible that this native tendency was encouraged by his discovery of the profusion and variety of compounds in Welsh.

¹ Editor's Preface to Notes, *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. Robert Bridges; second ed., enlarged by Charles Williams, Oxford, 1930 (*Poems*), p. 97.

² Vide Kenneth Jackson, *Studies in Early Celtic Nature Poetry*, Cambridge, 1935, pp. 177, 50.

³ References to Hopkins's poems are to the

number in *Poems*: the number of the stanza is also given in references to 'The Wreck of the Deutschland', and the number of the line in references to 'The Loss of the Eurydice'.

⁴ Cited by W. J. Gruffudd, 'Barddoniaeth Cymru cyn Dafydd ap Gwilym', *Trans. Soc. Cymm.* 1937, pp. 257-83.

In one of his later poems, 'Harry Ploughman' (43), Hopkins ventured to introduce what was, in English poetry, a startling innovation; instead of 'see his lilylocks windlaced', he wrote,

See his wind-lilylocks-laced:

Hopkins himself confessed to Bridges, 'Dividing a compound word by a clause sandwiched into it was a desperate deed, I feel, and I do not feel that it was an unquestionable success'.¹ But such a separation of the two elements of a compound was practised in Welsh poetry, especially with proper names: the name 'Talesin' is so divided in the following couplet:

Dull Tal—(tri hual traheirdd)
—iesin a'r ddau Ferddin feirdd;

and the use of the device in the older poetry partly justifies Williams's oft-ridiculed 'Constant-fawr-inople'.² In view of the notoriety of the practice, it is possible that Hopkins was acquainted with it.

The interruption of a sentence in its course by an interpolated exclamation or remark is a figure which occurs very frequently in the Welsh poetry of most periods, and Hopkins often employs it in his mature poetry, as in

...lustily he his low lot (feel
That ne'er need hunger, Tom; Tom seldom sick,
Seldomer heartsore, that treads through, prickproof, thick
Thousands of thorns, thoughts) swings though... (42)

Sometimes a sentence in Welsh verse is interrupted between two words which, although not compounded, are closely connected, such as 'perchen tŷ', 'owner of a house', in the following couplet:

Goreu perchen (â'r wên wîw)
Tŷ o Adda hyd heddiw.³

Hopkins, again in 'Harry Ploughman', has

...finds his, as at a roll-call, rank.

From this to 'sandwiching' a clause into a compound word is not a long step.

Without interrupting a sentence in this way, the order of words in Welsh poetry may be changed by various means. Inversions of many kinds are permissible; for instance, the order of a subject and verb, or of a noun and adjective, may be different from that of prose. A common practice is that of '*trawsfynedrad*', literally, 'going-across'; the poet, instead of putting a word in its logical position, as, for instance, an adjective after its noun, or a subject after its verb, allows several other words to intervene. Thus Tudur Aled writes,

Gwyn a rout im gwyn o'r tau,⁴

'white wine of thine thou gavest me', where 'gwyn', 'wine' is separated from its adjective by 'a rout im', 'thou gavest me'. In the same way, Hopkins divides 'soft bloom' in these lines:

Or if there does some soft,
On things aloof, aloft,
Bloom breathe... (37)

and 'perilous gold' in

...gold go garlanded
With, perilous, O no... (42)

¹ *L.R.B.* p. 265.

³ Vide *ibid.* § 127, p. 83.

² Vide John Morris-Jones, *Cerdd Dafod*, Oxford, 1925, § 126, p. 83.

⁴ Vide *ibid.* § 133, p. 87.

But there is an instance of this in the early 'Habit of Perfection', written in about 1866; the adjectives 'not laboured-at nor spun' are separated from their noun in

And hly-coloured clothes provide
Your spouse not laboured-at nor spun.

Hopkins's word order is for the most part peculiarly his own: his use of syntax is not logical, but dramatic, and some of his unusual constructions arise from a desire for emphasis. His unconventional style is based on the current speech of his age, and the promise of an individual and vital diction in the three 'Early Poems' suggests that Hopkins's idiom was so moulded by the force of his genius, and by his interest in English as a living language, that external influences could at most only modify or develop some of its characteristics. But it is certain that several of the apparent eccentricities of Hopkins's diction have been freely employed by Welsh poets, and since the characteristic Welsh mode of expression, and even of thought, is in some respects so close to his own, it is at least possible that his natural tendency to brevity and an exclamatory unsyntactical style was encouraged and developed by his study of Welsh.

Hopkins's notes on 'Rhythm and the other structural parts of Rhetoric—verse', written probably between September 1873 and July 1874,¹ contain the first evidence of his study of 'the lettering of syllables'² in poetry, and show that in the period immediately preceding his residence at St Beuno's, he had already a keen interest in poetic devices resembling those which he later found in Welsh verse. He includes alliteration and rhyme among various means of breaking the monotony of rhythm, and mentions another form of 'consonant-chime', 'shothending', or alliteration between final consonants; he had seen instances of this and of internal rhyme in G. P. Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language*. . . (New York, 1860), and it appears that both devices were still new to him, for he does not supplement the information given by his authority, and there is a thrill of discovery in his admiration for the 'beautifully rich combination'³ of initial and final consonant rhyme in the Norse poetry quoted by Marsh.

Hopkins's free use of initial alliteration often gives his work a superficial resemblance to Anglo-Saxon verse, but a closer parallel might be found in early Welsh poetry, in which alliteration is used as occasion demands, sometimes freely, sometimes not at all. The earliest poets employed both alliteration and internal rhyme to give euphony and emphasis to their work, but they were at liberty to dispense with either or both if they desired. The early medieval period was one of experiment, when the poets evolved various alliterative patterns or combinations of alliteration and rhyme. As time passed, some of these patterns were, for different reasons, discarded, while others became increasingly popular and finally, some time after the end of the thirteenth century, obligatory.⁴ It is with the work of the experimentalists, the poets of the period when the *cynghanedd* was still fluid, that Hopkins's poetry may be most profitably compared. In both there is an alternation of comparative simplicity and extreme elaboration, and by the side of Hopkins's initial alliteration, and of what appears to be direct imitation of Welsh *cynghanedd*, it is easy to trace in his mature poems the successive degrees of intricacy which originally gave rise to the system in Welsh.

¹ Vide Editor's Preface to *N.* p. xxviii.

² *N.* pp. 222, 241. ³ *N.* p. 246.

⁴ I am indebted to the account of the growth of *cynghanedd* by Tom Parry: 'Twf y Gyng-

hanedd', *Trans. Soc. Cymm.* 1936, pp. 143 ff., from which the examples of Welsh poetry illustrating the development of *cynghanedd* are taken.

Welsh poets began in very early times to alliterate two pairs of initial consonants. this appears frequently in Hopkins's work, as in

Flashing like flecks of coal (37)
And the braided ear breaks out of the sheath. (64)

A further step was to extend the correspondence to the medial consonants of the alliterating words: with such instances in Welsh as

Ryfei farw cyn *Madawg mad aned*
 Ar ei *helw a hwylynt trallynwys*

may be compared the following lines from 'The Wreck of the Deutschland':

And cipher of suffering Christ (st. 22)
 O *Father*, not under Thy *feathers*, nor ever as guessing (st. 12)
 More *brightening* her, rare-dear *Britain*, as his reign rolls (st. 35)

Sometimes the correspondence extended to the ends of words:

Nid oedud *fygwyl* *fugail* Prydain.

There are numerous examples of this in Hopkins's poetry, such as

With the *gnarls* of the *nails* in thee, niche of the lance, his (4, st. 23)
 Death with a sovereignty that *heeds* but *hides*, *bodes* but *abides* (4, st. 32)
Undenized, beyond bound (42)
 His crisp *combs*, and that *comes* those ways we know (46)
 And the riot of a *rout* (73)

In early Welsh poetry, the alliterative words or syllables were usually in the middle of the line, separated by one or two non-alliterating words, and with other non-alliterating words at the beginning of the line. As poets began to desire greater intricacy, it became customary to alliterate a word near the beginning with a word in the gap between the two sets of alliterative sounds. The result is seen in lines like

A *llu* o Brydain / a *llwrw* hybrydded.

Here the two words 'llu', 'llwrw' do not alliterate throughout; there is nothing to correspond with the *r* of 'llwrw'. This is exactly what has happened in Hopkins's line

Warm-laid grave / of a womb-life grey (4, st. 7)

where the correspondence between 'laid' and 'life' is incomplete.

Where there was alliteration throughout, it produced either *cynganedd groes* or *cynganedd draws*. In *cyngghanedd groes* the line is divided into two parts, and all the consonants preceding the final accented syllable in the first section follow in the same order in the second section, and if the line ends with an unaccented syllable, the consonants immediately after the accents must alliterate too, as in

Teg edrych / tuag adref : t g dr / t g dr.¹

No consonant except *n*, *f*, *h*, and sometimes *m*, may stand at the beginning of the line without alliterating, but such consonants may occur at the beginning of the second part, after the caesura, and between the two sequences of alliteration. When this happens, the line is said to contain *cynganedd draws*. An example is

Gan Dduw / mae digon i ddyn.

¹ Examples of the established types of *cynganedd* are from John Morris-Jones, *Cerdd Dafod*.

This is a line of seven syllables: in longer lines it sometimes happens that there are one or more syllables at the end which do not alliterate with anything in the body of the line, and in the works of the early medieval poets, who had a preference for lines of nine syllables, *cynganedd bengoll*, as this is called, is frequent. It appears in Hopkins's poetry:

Now burn, new born to the world (4, st. 34)

The cross to her she calls *Christ* to her, christens her wild-worst Best (4, st. 24)¹

and it is in short lines that he approaches most closely to strict *cynganedd*:

The blood-gush blade-gash (64)²

Foam-tuft fumitory (64)

The down-duged ground-hugged grey. (4, st. 26)

In the second example the *r* of 'fumitory' should, strictly speaking, be alliterated. In the third the initial *d* of 'down-duged' is not alliterated, and the line consequently contains *cynganedd wreiddgoll*, which was not uncommon in the work of the medieval Welsh poets.

In the earliest Welsh poetry internal rhyme was frequently used instead of alliteration, and served the same purpose of giving additional emphasis to the stressed syllables of a line; it often has this function in Hopkins's poetry, as in

Was around them, bound them or wound them with her. (17, l. 44)

Rhyme in old Welsh poetry sometimes marked the end of a hemistich as well as the end of a line, and rhyme between the final syllables of the two hemistichs was essential in several popular metres of later times; in the metre known as *Cyhydedd Hir*, for instance, the couplet is divided into four parts, the first three rhyming together and the fourth ending with the principal rhyme. It is not peculiar to Welsh verse, and Hopkins already knew of it when he wrote his notes on 'Rhythm and the other structural parts of Rhetoric—verse'. He uses it frequently; in 6, 59, and 73 it appears in the third line of each stanza, and there are many instances elsewhere; for example,

All things rising, all things sizing (18)

Fallow, foam-fallow, hanks—fall'n off their ranks. (63)

The only kind of *cynganedd* depending upon rhyme alone is *cynganedd lusg*. Every line of this ends in a polysyllabic word with the accent on the penultimate syllable, which in Welsh is the regular position; the final syllable is therefore unaccented. The line is divided into two parts, and the last syllable of the first part rhymes with the accented penultimate. Hopkins has only one exact parallel:

Tongue-true, vaunt—and tauntless. (23)

The use of *cynganedd lusg* would have obliged him either to rhyme an unaccented syllable with an accented one, which he rarely did, although it was customary in Welsh, or to use a double rhyme like *dauntless/tauntless* (23). There are, however,

¹ 'The' is not alliterated, but its omission from the alliteration seems as justifiable as that of *n* in Welsh.

² The alliteration of the final consonants in the two hemistichs (*gush, gash*) is regarded in

Welsh as constituting half-rhyme or *proest* with the end-rhyme (*proest i'r odl*). This, although common in the poetry of the principal *cywyddwyr*, was proscribed at the end of the fifteenth century.

some lines in which the penultimate syllable rhymes with a word which precedes it in the line, and the last two syllables are both accented:

Eärs, and the *cáll* of the *táll* nún (4, st. 19)

From life's *dáwn* it is *dráwn* dówn (4, st. 20)

With a *flóod* or a *fáll*, low *lúll*-off or *dúll* róar (11)

and Hopkins probably had *cynganedd lusg* in mind when he wrote them.

In Hopkins's poetry, as in the Welsh, internal rhyme is usually combined with alliteration. In early medieval Welsh poetry they appeared side by side in the line, but were usually unrelated. Sometimes alliteration came first and rhyme second, as in Hopkins's line,

With heaven's lights *high* hung *round*, or mother-*ground*. (42)

They were connected by introducing a word to rhyme with one of the alliterating words, as in

Arglwyf glew *gadarn* *haearn* dyfyt.

The same order appears in some of Hopkins's lines:

Tells *Mary* her *mirth* till Christ's *birth* (18)

A released *shower*, let flash to the *shire*, not a lightening of *fire* hard-hurled (4, st. 34)

The *bald* and *bold* blinking *gold* when all's done. (62)

Sometimes the order was reversed, so that the rhyme preceded the alliteration; this occurs quite frequently in Hopkins's poetry:

Hack and *rack* the growing *green* (19)

Where self*wrung*, self*strung*, sheathe—and shelterless... (32)

Here again, the second rhyming word was included in the alliteration, and *cynganedd sain* was thus produced. In this the line is divided into three parts; the end of the first part rhymes with the end of the second, and the second alliterates with the end-rhyme, as in

Ni bydd cytún / hun / a haint
Heb gellwair / â'i air / a'i wyl.

Cynganedd sain was the favourite ornament of the *Gogynfeirdd*, and Hopkins, too, seems to have preferred it to other types of *cynganedd*. The following are instances:

Time's *tasking*, it is fathers that *asking* for *ease* (4, st. 27)

Down in dim woods the diamond *delves*! the *elves*'-eyes! (8)

How ring right out our sordid turbid *time* (11)

In grimy vasty vault. (37)

Only the last example is accented as this type of *cynganedd sain* is in Welsh, but it may be noticed that when Hopkins uses the pattern in longer lines, the rhyming words are preceded by alliteration (*time's tasking*, *dim...diamond delves*), so that the *cynganedd* in the latter part of the line is not its sole ornament. In Welsh poetry this further elaboration was usually unnecessary because of the shortness of the line. There are, however, other variations. An easier form of *cynganedd sain*, called *cynganedd sain gadwynog*, is particularly common in the work of Dafydd ap Gwilym; the line is divided into four parts, of which the first rhymes with the third, and the second alliterates with the fourth, as follows:

Hael Forfudd / merch / fedydd / Mai.

Hopkins uses this occasionally; in the following lines, for instance:

With, perilous, O nó; nor yet plod safe shod sound (42)
And wears man's smudge and shares man's smell; the soil (7)

Sain deirodl, with three rhyming words instead of two, the last alliterating with the end-rhyme, occurs fairly frequently in Welsh, and there are one or two examples in Hopkins's poetry:

Off hér once skeined stained véined variety... (32)
Within her wears, bears, cares and combs the same (51)¹

It was considered a technical feat in Welsh when *cynganedd sain* occurred twice in a single line, as follows:

Dan gaen maen mur, Dudur deg.

Here 'gaen maen mur' form one *cynganedd*, and 'mur, Dudur deg' another. In a line from 'The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo', double *cynganedd sain* is combined with assonance and alliteration:

How to keep—is there any any, is there none such,
nowhere known some, bow or brooch or braid or brace,
lace, latch, or catch or key to keep.

An isolated line in one of the unfinished poems (53) is hardly less remarkable:

Or a jaunting vaunting vaulting assaulting trumpet telling.

Here the pattern is, as it were, reversed within itself, thus:

jaunting vaunting vaulting; vaunting vaulting assaulting.

This variation was apparently of Hopkins's own invention.

Hopkins uses other combinations of rhyme and alliteration which, although they are not found in Welsh poetry, recall *cynganedd sain* and were probably suggested by it. In a few lines there are two alliterating words at the end:

All the air things wear that build this world of Wales (16)

Fall, gall themselves and gash gold-vermilion. (12)

Sometimes the first rhyming word, instead of the second, is included in the alliteration, as in

Banned by the land of their birth (4, st. 21)

Strike, churl; hurl, cheerless wind, then; heltering hail (71)

Some of the lines quoted above contain *cynganedd bengoll*, but *cynganedd sain* is less difficult to adapt to long lines than the types of *cynganedd* which depend on alliteration alone, and some of Hopkins's variations and extensions of the pattern seem to have arisen from his desire to leave no part of the line without ornament.

Hopkins's use of alliteration and internal rhyme is not confined to single lines; both devices are an essential part of his stanza structure. Always in theory, and often in practice, the stanza, not the line, is the unit of his poems. The meaning is frequently incomplete within a single line, and to facilitate the movement of the mind from one line to another, Hopkins sometimes uses alliteration as a means of linking them, especially when the break in sense and syntax at the end of the first line is abrupt; for example:

Well, she has thee for the pain, for the
Patience; but pity of the rest of them! (4, st. 31)
...that treads through, prickproof, thick
Thousands of thorns, thoughts... (42)

¹ Bridges emended 'combs' to 'moulds'; vide note to 51, *Poems*, pp. 118-19.

In the following instances several consonants alliterate:

Of reality the rarest-veined unraveller; a not
Rivalled insight... (20)

...this to hoard unheard
Heard unheeded, leaves me a lonely began. (44)

and, in view of Hopkins's interest in the *englyn*, it is just possible that the alliteration in these lines was suggested by the *cynganedd* between the end of the first line and the beginning of the second in the *englyn unodl union*, as in

Dilyneis, clwyfais, fal y'm clyw—deckant
Y decaf o ðyn byw¹

but there are no other instances, and this explanation, although attractive, is entirely conjectural.

Hopkins occasionally connects his lines by means of rhyme; for instance:

Blue-beating and hoary-glow height; or night, still higher,
With belled fire and the moth-soft Milky Way (4, st. 26)

The Simon Peter of a soul! to the blast
Tarpeian-fast, but a blown beacon of light. (4, st. 29)

Rhyme between the end of one line and the word immediately preceding the *cæsura* in the following line is common in Welsh verse; it occurs in several strict metres² and in 'free' poetry (so called because it does not contain *cynganedd*). Sometimes in Hopkins the second internal rhyme coincides with the first stress of the line, and the first is in the middle of the preceding line, not at the end:

What by your *mésure* is the háven of desíre
The *trésure* never éyesight gót, nor was évér guessed whát for the héaring (4, st. 26)

Has óne fétch in her; she réars herself to divíne
Éárs, and the cáll of the táll nún. (4, st. 19)

In Welsh poetry rhyme would not be found in these positions, nor are there any parallels in Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language*... This unusual type of internal rhyme may be a development from the other and more frequent variety.

In some of Hopkins's poems there are passages in which rhyme and alliteration and half-rhyme are combined in an intricate pattern which extends through several lines. One instance occurs in the unfinished 'Woodlark':

The ear in *milk*, *lush* the *sash*
And *crush-silk* poppies *afash*
The blood-*gush* blade-*gash*
Flame-*rash* *rudred*
Bud shelling or broad-shed... (64)

In this case, in addition to complete or rudimentary *cynganedd* within single lines, there are three sets of internal rhymes: *milk/silk*; *lush/crush*; *rud/bud*; and *rash* rhymes with the end-rhymes *gash*, etc., which in turn form half-rhymes with *lush*, *crush*, *gush*. Lines 2-6 in stanza 8 of the 'Deutschland', lines 16-18 of 'Tom's Garland' (42) and lines 3-5 of the sonnet (34) are equally intricate.

This astonishingly elaborate relationship between end-rhyme, interior rhyme and 'consonant-chime' is obviously inspired by Welsh poetry, partly, perhaps, by the *englynion* which Hopkins studied, although the *englyn* is by no means the most elaborate form used in Welsh. But even Welsh poets have not often attained such a degree of intricacy as that in the passage by Hopkins quoted above, and it would

¹ Vide Morris-Jones, *op. cit.* §§ 544-6, pp. 321-3. ² Vide e.g. *ibid.* § 552, p. 327, § 564, p. 315.

be impossible to find even an approximate parallel for it in any of the twenty-four metres of Welsh poetry.

Hopkins's theory that the stanza was the unit of the poem helped to justify one of his most daring innovations, the 'rove-over' rhyme, which 'depends on running over to the next line'.¹ The first example is in stanza 14 of 'The Wreck of the Deutschland':

leeward / drew her D(ead):

and there are others in stanzas 31 and 35, in 'The Loss of the Eurydice' (17), lines 23-24, and in 'The Bugler's First Communion' (23), lines 3-4. In his notes on rhyme in 'Rhythm and the other parts of Rhetoric—verse', Hopkins included among imperfect rhymes 'when the rhyme ends in the middle of a word, if, for instance, the word is partly in one line, partly in another'.² This is ambiguous; Hopkins may be referring merely to a separation of syllables, as when, for instance, in 'To what serves Mortal Beauty?' (38) *storm* rhymes with *swarmed*, and *glance* with *dancing*. This practice is not uncommon in his later poetry, whereas the last example of 'running-over' rhyme is in a poem written in 1879 (23). The latter type of rhyme is known in Welsh by the name of *odl gudd* (concealed rhyme). According to Sir John Morris-Jones,³ it may be used within the line of *cynganedd sain* and *cynganedd lusg*, and as a principal rhyme in the *paladr* of an *englyn* or a *toddaid*, where the principal rhyme is not at the end of the line, as in

Nid af i Lan Daf am nad wy'—lawen
Mae Lewys heb ddim hwyl;

but it was only long after the classical period that poets began to use *odl gudd* at the end of a line.

Even if Hopkins had not seen any instances of *odl gudd* at the end of lines in Welsh poetry, he was almost certainly familiar with it in *cynganedd* and in the *englyn*, and it seems highly probable that it was his reading of Welsh which prompted him to experiment with this type of rhyme.

As far as the texture of the verse is concerned, it is impossible to trace a clear consecutive development in Hopkins's work. There is an early group of poems in which alliteration and internal rhyme are used extensively: the 'Deutschland' (4), 'God's Grandeur' (7), 'The Starlight Night' (8), 'The Sea and the Skylark' (11), 'The Woodlark' (64), and possibly the undated fragment (53); but other poems of the same period are of little interest in this respect. Most of the poems written in the years 1877-9 contain what appear to be reminiscences of *cynganedd*, although some, such as 'Morning Midday and Evening Sacrifice' (24), 'The Candle Indoors' (26), and 'Brothers' (30) have only initial alliteration, and there is an attempt at 'plainness and severity'⁴ in the 'Andromeda' of 1879. Hopkins's contemptuous reference to his 'salad days' implies that in 1882 he was no longer 'fascinated with *cynganedd*', yet it was at this time that he corrected 'The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo', and embodied in the first line the instance of *cynganedd sain ddrwl* quoted above. This is one of a later group of poems in which Hopkins's experiments in *cynganedd* are seen to be bearing fruit; the others are 'Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves' (32), the sonnet beginning 'As kingfishers catch fire...' (34), 'Tom's Garland' (42), and 'That Nature is a Heraclitean Fire...' (48), dated 1881, 1882, 1887 and 1888 respectively: it has been pointed out above that his last poem (51) contains an echo of *cynganedd sain*.

¹ Robert Bridges, *Notes to Poems*, p. 104.

² *N.* p. 245.

³ *Cerdd Dafod*, pp. 252-3, from which the specimen of *odl gudd* in Welsh is taken.

⁴ *L.R.B.* p. 87.

The internal evidence of Hopkins's poems, which is confirmed by the letters, proves fairly conclusively that the Welsh is the predominant source of his characteristic rhymes and 'consonant-chimes'. There is reason to believe that, even if Hopkins had never gone to St Beuno's, had never studied Welsh poetry, his mature work would have contained instances of internal rhyme, half-rhyme, and alliteration, but they would not have been found in the same profusion, or in such a variety of patterns.

From the eagerness with which Hopkins adopted *cyghanedd*, and the original and felicitous use which he made of it, it appears to have accorded with some inherent quality in his own mind. He was deeply interested in music, and he must have been immediately attracted by the loveliness of sound which *cyghanedd* is capable of producing. These melodic potentialities he exploited to the full; Professor Abbott notes that some of his poems 'seems to aspire to the state of music'.¹ Several passages in Hopkins's poetry might be compared with the work of a technically accomplished Welsh poet like Dafydd Nanmor, in which the verbal music is so exquisite and sustained that the sound tends to become autonomous; the interest of the poem's form is in fact 'over and above its interest in meaning'. Similarly, when some of Hopkins's richly textured lines are read aloud, the listener's ear is so fascinated by the chime of alliteration, rhyme and assonance that his attention is distracted from the argument of the poem, and he overlooks the close relationship which usually exists between substance and sound. For sound in Hopkins's poetry is rarely, if ever, independent of the meaning. For instance, in the description of the cornfield in 'The Woodlark' (64), the elaborately patterned word-music is not so inorganic as it may at first appear; the vividness of the impression owes almost as much to the richness of the sound as to the intense colour of the word-painting; either is the expression of the poet's sensuous awareness and delight in physical beauty and energy.

Occasionally, of course, Hopkins uses vocalic correspondences with onomatopoeic intention. The supreme instance is 'The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo', of which Hopkins said, 'I never did anything more musical'.² The idea of the piece was probably suggested by his experiments in *cyghanedd*, which, modified and developed, was an ideal medium for the subject.

But, although the musical effects in Hopkins's poetry are among his most remarkable achievements, an equal melodic beauty and expressiveness may be found in the work of poets who knew nothing of *cyghanedd*. It was, above all, for force and emphasis that he strove, and these are probably the qualities which are most characteristic of his style. He recognized in the devices of *cyghanedd* a means of making the language of poetry more forcible, of giving to the common speech on which it is founded the heightened emphasis of rhetoric. Rhyme and initial alliteration in Welsh poetry, as Hopkins must have noticed, have more than a purely ornamental function, they join with the rhythm to give additional weight and prominence to significant words. When, for instance, Siôn Cent describes how the dead body of an unloved rich man is despatched in a splendid coffin

Ar frýs o'r llys tua'r llán³

'in haste from the palace towards the church', the *cyghanedd* drives home the poet's meaning as by a series of hammer-blows. We may compare the use of *cyghanedd sain* in Hopkins's unfinished poem 'To his Watch' (70), where the poet's

¹ Introduction to *L.R.B.* p. xxxiii.

² *L.R.W.D.* p. 149.

³ Quoted by Saunders Lewis, *Braslun o Hanes Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg*, vol. I, Cardiff, 1932, p. 112.

anguished consciousness of the passage of time, and of the inevitable approach of the day when he must 'fail at his force', presents to him with terrible finality the decree

One spëll and wëll that óne...;

the phrase, with its heavily weighted stresses, has a rhythm as insistent as the beat of a pendulum. The force and tautness of Hopkins's verse owes much to his use of partial or complete consonantal correspondence; any of the lines in which it is employed, such as

Christ's lily and beást of the wáste wóod (4, st. 20)

or

I am sóft sift
In an hourglass .. (4, st. 4)

illustrates how it contributes to the 'markedness' and expressional power of his rhythm. But even unaccented syllables are sometimes included in the pattern of rhyme and alliteration, as often happens in Welsh poetry; the effect of the practice is that nominally weak syllables are strengthened, so that they cannot be hurried over. Some of the intricately laced internal rhymes in the passage on the plight of the unemployed in 'Tom's Garland', which help to give to the poet's expression of his indignation the fierce emphasis of impassioned oratory, are unaccented, and there is a striking instance in 'Spelt from Sibyl's Leaves':

Where, sëlfrwung, sëlfrstrung, sheáthe—and shëlterless....

In *cynganedd* goes the correspondence of consonants affects both stressed and unstressed syllables: this again necessitates the leisurely, emphatic reading which Hopkins desired for his poetry,¹ and, by calling attention to each separate word, it may even seem to heighten the significance of the whole line. This effect is noticeable in such a line as

Warm-laid grave of a womb-life grey, (4, st. 7)

which has the outstanding excellences of the best poetry in the Welsh classical tradition; the *cynganedd* is not a mere adventitious ornament, it seems rather that it has actually helped to achieve that remarkable concentration and profundity, the pregnant paradoxical association of 'grave' and 'grey' with 'life' and 'warm', which presents with epigrammatic brevity the mystery of Christ's submission to the living death of bodily existence.

This takes us beyond the more general and obvious use of *cynganedd* as a means of making verse more musical, more emphatic, or both. Either function is one which it commonly performs in Welsh poetry. But, as employed by Hopkins, it has a further capacity; it may, as Dr Leavis says, 'give words new associations and bring diverse ideas and emotions together'.² For instance, in stanzas 22 and 23 of the 'Deutschland', the passage which Mr Gardner calls 'an amazing "metaphysical" digression... on the fortuitously mystical theme of Five',³ the poet associates the number of the drowned Franciscan nuns with the stigmata, the 'cinquefoil token' received by the founder of their order. The imaginative power which helps us to accept the conceit is apparent in the alliteration:

Five! the finding and sake
And cipher of suffering Christ...
...five-livèd and leavèd favour and pride...;

¹ Vide *L.R.B.* p. 246.

² *New Bearings in English Poetry*, London, 1932, p. 174.

³ 'The Wreck of the Deutschland', *Essays and Studies*, vol. xxi, 1935, p. 145.

the similarity in sound of 'cipher' and 'suffer', 'lived' and 'leaved', 'five' and 'favour' suggests the mystical affinity which Hopkins is attempting to trace. A similar phenomenon is seen in stanza 24:

The cross to her she calls Christ to her....

The sound pattern which Hopkins introduced into his last poem:

Nine months she then, nay years, nine years she long
Within her wears, bears, cares and combs the same (51)

is symbolical of the process which it expresses, the gradual, controlled development of the poetic idea.

Critics who have analysed other passages in Hopkins's poems have concluded that his vocalic correspondences are wholly organic. The precise responses evoked by such devices inevitably vary according to the temperament and experience of the reader, but it may be safely said that they are never used mechanically or capriciously. Hopkins was not fettered by the necessity of adhering to rules, and this independence is his strength. Many of the particular effects which he produced by employing *cynghanedd* would be impossible in Welsh verse, where the poet is obliged to maintain a more or less uniform level of intricacy throughout a poem; the intrinsic value of *cynghanedd* is increased in Hopkins's poetry by its novelty in English, which startles the reader into attention, and persuades him, as Mr Charles Williams observes, of 'the existence of a vital and surprising poetic energy';¹ and by its alternation with a plainer style, which offsets its elaboration and forms an astonishing and brilliant variety of texture.

Obviously, Hopkins was not a man who could be content with mere imitation: 'The effect of studying masterpieces is to make me admire and do otherwise. So it must be on every original artist to some degree, on me to a marked degree.'² The poems bear witness to the truth of this statement, but it represents only one aspect of his attitude to the question of 'influence'. In 1879 he wrote to Bridges, '... I do not think it desirable that I shd. be wholly uninfluenced by you or you by me; one ought to be independent but not unimpressionable: that wd. be to resist education.'³ If this is slightly narrowed in its application, it may be said to imply that when a poet discovers anything, such as a technical device, which may help him to a more vigorous, a more complete, and therefore more individual utterance, there is no reason why he should not make use of it; it is his duty to do so. Hopkins found such devices in Welsh poetry, but we have seen him experimenting, adapting his materials to suit his own purposes, transmuting them until we almost lose sight of the original elements. His poetry has nothing of the debility of verse which is merely derivative or written according to theory; it is a living thing, highly organized, a growth which may have been nourished by various influences, but in itself unique and vigorously independent.

GWENETH LILLY

LIVERPOOL

¹ Introduction to *Poems*, p. xii.

² *L.R.B.* p. 291.

³ *L.R.B.* p. 80.

ON THE TRAIL OF ARTHUR RIMBAUD¹

The life and works of Arthur Rimbaud have been for more than half a century the subject of investigation and research, but it is astonishing how much can still be brought to light, even from the purely biographical point of view. As soon as the investigator is in the position to verify for himself the evidence, he discovers that a large number of the statements made by the first biographers of the poet—Paterne Berrichon (Isabelle Rimbaud's spokesman), Delahaye (Rimbaud's schoolmate), and Houin and Bourguignon (his close friends)—are utterly false, and also that even what the poet himself related must be treated with extreme caution because he delighted in 'pulling his hearers' leg'.

'Je veux croire, pour l'excuser', wrote Isabelle Rimbaud to Paterne Berrichon (letter 21 August 1896, published in *Ébauches*, p. 110), 'que M. Delahaye s'est laissé colossalement mystifier par Rimbaud lequel aimait à étonner les gens d'air crédule en leur faisant, avec le plus grand sérieux, des récits fantastiques sur son propre compte;—quitte à rire ensuite des badauds qui l'avaient écouté béants de surprise et de terreur.'

Undoubtedly the period of his life which still remains most mysterious is that of his wandering years, after he abandoned poetry in 1873 until 1878 when he settled as a trader in Abyssinia,² and this period still offers a wide field for biographical research.

When this period has been fully investigated—if ever it can be—when we shall know—if indeed we can ever now know—what were his occupations and pre-occupations during these five years, then we shall be in a better position than we are at present to paint the definitive portrait of the poet.

The further the investigator penetrates into Rimbaud's mysterious life the more convinced he becomes that the poet was less of a Bohemian than he wished to be thought, far less Bohemian than is usually believed, and certainly far less Bohemian than his friends imagined. A daring adventurer certainly, who gambled for high ultimate stakes, but not a happy-go-lucky Bohemian. Delahaye, who eventually became a typical French *petit fonctionnaire*, liked to see in the youth who had once outstripped him in class, the *fort en thème* who had gone to the bad.

At all events until one is in the position to verify for oneself the statements made by Arthur Rimbaud's friends and family one cannot be certain that they are sound.

Houin and Bourguignon, as well as Delahaye, tell the story of a visit paid by Rimbaud to Sweden in 1877 as a member of Loisset's circus. They say that he was subsequently repatriated in a penniless condition by the French Consulate at Stockholm. It is probable that Rimbaud himself told them this tale.

The simplest way to verify this statement, which has been repeated in all biographies of Rimbaud, was to write direct to the French Legation at Stockholm to find whether there existed in the archives of the office any mention of Rimbaud. A letter elicited the following reply:³

¹ A large part of the material used in this article—particularly the investigations into movements of ships from Java to Europe in 1876—was collected for me by Miss H. A. Beecham, and I wish here to express my gratitude to her for her valuable help. With infinite patience she went through several years of daily papers and

periodicals and a large number of records in public offices.

² The Abyssinian period has been studied by the present author in *Rimbaud in Abyssinia* (Clarendon Press) and, with further unpublished material, in *Rimbaud en Abyssinie* (Payot).

³ Unfortunately this reply did not reach me in time to use it in my work *Arthur Rimbaud*.

Légation de la République Française en Suède.
Mademoiselle,

Stockholm, 9 mars 1938.

Par votre lettre du 20 février, vous avez bien voulu demander s'il existait dans les archives de la Légation (il n'y a pas de Consulat de France à Stockholm) un dossier concernant le poète français Rimbaud qui serait venu en Suède en 1877 et aurait été rapatrié aux frais du Gouvernement français. J'ai l'honneur de vous faire savoir que les recherches que j'ai fait faire ne m'ont fourni aucune indication à cet égard et je ne puis que vous exprimer mes regrets de n'avoir pas pu mieux seconder l'intérêt que vous portez à cet épisode de la vie de Rimbaud.

Veillez agréer, Mademoiselle, mes respectueux hommages.

This answer did not seem to me conclusive. It was not clear whether it only meant that Rimbaud had not been repatriated through the services of the French Consul, or merely that no records existed for the year 1877. A further letter to the French Legation in Stockholm brought the reply that if no record existed concerning Rimbaud's journey to Sweden in 1877 this did not necessarily mean that he had not in fact been to the country, but only that he had had no dealings with the Consulate and that he had certainly not been repatriated at the expense of the government. Complete records for all such transactions exist in the registers of the Legation.

Stockholm, le 28 juin 1938.

Mademoiselle,

Avant de répondre à votre lettre du 27 avril j'ai voulu faire à nouveau des recherches dans les archives de cette Légation. Si aucun dossier concernant le passage de Rimbaud en Suède en 1877 n'y a été découvert, cela n'implique pas forcément qu'il n'y soit pas venu à cette époque, mais tout simplement qu'il n'a pas dû être en relations avec la Légation ou tout au moins qu'il n'a pas été rapatrié par ses soins. Nos archives conservent encore effectivement les dossiers de 1877 ainsi que les registres d'enregistrement de la correspondance échangée entre la Légation et le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, sur lequel ne figure nulle part pour cette année là le nom de Rimbaud.

Je regrette de ne pouvoir vous fournir ainsi que des renseignements négatifs, et vous prie d'agréer, Mademoiselle, mes respectueux hommages.

The legend of Rimbaud's adventure in Sweden with the circus must have been invented by Rimbaud himself to amuse and astonish his friends. It is true that Isabelle Rimbaud, in a letter to Paternie Berrichon when he was preparing his biography of Rimbaud, denied the truth of the story, but Paternie Berrichon did not take any account of her denial and the legend figures in his book and has been taken as a statement of fact by all subsequent biographers. 'Jamais je ne l'ai entendu parler de ce cirque Loisset', wrote Isabelle Rimbaud (Letter December 1896, published in *Ébauches*, p. 209).

The account of Rimbaud's enlistment in the Dutch colonial army has been thoroughly investigated by M. Marmelstein and he has published the result of his researches in *Le Mercure de France* (15 July 1922) and in *Le Bulletin des Amis de Rimbaud* (no. 6, 1937). We know without any shadow of doubt that Rimbaud enlisted in the Dutch colonial army on 19 May 1876, and that he received a bonus of 300 gold francs—£12 at that time. We know that he landed at Batavia on 23 July and that he deserted on 15 August. But we do not know whether it was from Batavia or Salatiga that he deserted.

Through the kindness of Professor J. M. Carré of the Sorbonne I was allowed to consult the letter he received from a retired colonel at Batavia, M. C. F. A. Beretta, with the copy of Rimbaud's military papers which he had requested:

Ci joint je vous envoie un extrait officiel de la feuille d'immatriculation de Rimbaud. Il y paraît que Rimbaud était rayé des cadres de l'armée après quatre semaines. La

désertion étant très fréquente dans ces temps, où il y avait un grand nombre d'étrangers (Suisses, Allemands, Belges et Français [Communards]) dans l'armée coloniale néerlandaise. Les registres pénitentiaires de l'armée en garnison ne contiennent pas le nom de Rimbaud, les 22 jours que le poète a été en garnison à Batavia n'ont pas donné occasion à une transgression de la discipline militaire.

This passage does not necessarily imply that Rimbaud spent the whole of the 27 days at Batavia. M. Beretta does not mention Salatiga—probably because this name does not appear on Rimbaud's military papers. The document merely states that Rimbaud landed at Batavia on 23 July, that he was attached to the first battalion of infantry, and that on 15 August he deserted. It does not mention the destination of the battalion.

The copy of the military papers which M. Marmelstein received was accompanied by a letter which stated that as soon as Rimbaud's desertion was confirmed, his clothes and possessions were sold and the proceeds were given to a charitable institution at Salatiga. This would lead one to believe that it was from Salatiga and not from Batavia that Rimbaud deserted.

After his desertion, according to the first biographers, Rimbaud wandered through the jungle for weeks, even months, and eventually returned to England as a seaman on board a British ship carrying sugar. Whatever happened he cannot have wandered very long in the jungle since he was home in Charleville on 31 December and the journey, in those days, took three or four months. According to Delahaye, Rimbaud, after his desertion, wandered with delight through the island until he finally reached a port where a British sailing ship carrying sugar took him on as a seaman. This ship, after encountering a fierce storm as it sailed round the Cape, brought him to Liverpool whence he returned to France.

The story told by Houin and Bourguignon is similar except that they say that Rimbaud's ship, after having stopped at Liverpool, sailed along the coast of Britain, along the Scandinavian, Danish, Dutch and Belgian coasts, the coast of France, until it finally reached Bordeaux whence Rimbaud returned by train to Charleville. According to Paterne Berrichon, Rimbaud proceeded straight from Liverpool to Dieppe, thence to Charleville.

The arduous task of investigating the movements of all ships which arrived in Europe from Java between August and December necessitated the consulting of the daily bulletin, *Lloyd's Lists*, the weekly *Mitchell's Maritime Register*, *The Shipping and Commercial Express*, and, since the ship was alleged to have arrived at Liverpool, *The Liverpool Journal of Commerce*. It was eventually discovered that of the twenty-four ships which left Java between 15 August and 31 October 1876 fifteen only arrived in England or in France before January 1877.

The Register General of Shipping and Seamen in London preserves the papers and documents concerning all British ships in its archives. The records are complete and contain a copy of the contract of each individual member of every crew, his nationality, his wages; a report on his state of health and conduct during the voyage; the name of the port at which he joined the ship and of that at which he left it. With such records no error is possible. It was possible to see the papers of all the crews of seven of the fifteen possible ships—the other eight not being British their papers were not preserved at *The Register General of Shipping and Seamen*. The name of Rimbaud does not figure on any of the contracts, on any of the lists of seamen or in any of the reports. A specimen of Rimbaud's writing was compared with the signatures in all the contracts in case he had joined under an assumed name, but no writing remotely resembling his was to be found.

From this it follows that Rimbaud cannot have returned to Europe from the Dutch East Indies as a seaman on board a British ship. He may well have returned as a passenger, in which case his name would not figure in the books of *The Register General of Shipping and Seamen*. Or he might have returned as a passenger, or even a seaman, on board a non-British ship whose papers cannot be examined in England. Yet all the biographers of the poet have asserted that it was as a seaman and on board a British ship that he came back to England.

Another fact which emerges from these investigations is that no British ship, coming from Java, arrived in Liverpool in the period under review. One ship, *La Léonie*, coming from the Dutch East Indies, did put in some time before 23 December, but it was not a British ship and it has not been possible to discover its nationality, the composition of its crew or its destination.

These researches prove conclusively that the details given by Delahaye, by Paterne Berrichon, by Houin and Bourguignon concerning Rimbaud's return from Java are false. It is, however, highly probable that it was the poet himself who deceived his friends. The only facts which remain incontrovertible are that he deserted on 15 August, that he encountered a fierce storm on his return journey, and that he was back at Charleville for the new year 1877.

Amongst the ships which left Java and arrived in Europe during the period to be considered, two deserve special attention, *The Wandering Chief*, whose name alone makes it worthy of bearing *L'Homme aux Semelles de Vent*, and *La Léonie*.

The Wandering Chief, a British ship, carrying a cargo of sugar, left Samarang on 30 August. At that time there were several ports of call in Java, the most important of which were Batavia, Samarang and Sourabaya. If Rimbaud had deserted from Salatiga it is likely that he would have made for Samarang rather than for Batavia; first because he might be recognized in Batavia, and secondly because Samarang was only twenty-two miles distant, whereas Batavia was a hundred.

The Wandering Chief called at Saint Helena and encountered a very bad storm as it rounded the Cape during which it lost its mast and almost foundered. The ship on which Rimbaud was alleged to have returned was said to have suffered a similar fate (Paterne Berrichon, *La Vie de Jean-Arthur Rimbaud*, p. 119). It arrived at Havre on 17 December. The ship did not arrive at Liverpool and Rimbaud was not employed on board as a seaman, but he might have returned to Europe on it at his own expense.

The other ship, not flying the British flag, *La Léonie*, seems to have left Batavia some time in September—it has been impossible to ascertain the exact date—and arrived at Liverpool before 23 December, since it sailed for Newcastle that day. To reach Newcastle it would have been obliged to sail round the north of Scotland and it might well have put in at Norwegian, Dutch, Danish, Belgian and French ports, but if Rimbaud had been on board, and if he had gone as far as Bordeaux, he would hardly have been back in Charleville for New Year's day.

La Léonie probably ran into the same storm at the Cape that *The Wandering Chief* encountered, and Rimbaud might have been on board, either as a passenger or as a member of the crew.

Another period about which little precise is known is that of Rimbaud's stay in England between 1872 and 1874. Unfortunately, investigation has not produced results commensurate with the efforts expended. The records at the Foreign Office, the Home Office, the Passport Office and Scotland Yard have been searched in vain. Inquiries were made at the French consulates in the main towns of England and Scotland. The records at the local police stations in various quarters of London were

investigated without discovering anything. Rimbaud does not seem to have caused the police any trouble and there were no convictions against him.

Amongst the most interesting discoveries made were the entries in the registers of the British Museum—two entries of Rimbaud, two of Verlaine and one of the poet Germain Nouveau known as *Humilis*. Verlaine and Rimbaud signed their first requests for reader's tickets in March 1873, Verlaine on the 23rd and Rimbaud on the 25th. These entries contradict the statements made by Madame Méléra and Paternie Berrichon who obtained their material from Isabelle Rimbaud. Mme Méléra says (*Rimbaud*, p. 104) that Rimbaud returned to Charleville in February 1873. Paternie Berrichon writes (*Jean-Arthur Rimbaud, le Poète*, p. 230):

Dans le courant du mois de mars, étant toujours en proie à ces malaises, il fit, de Charleville, quelques courts voyages dans les capitales, aux fins exclusives d'y trouver un éditeur... Le jour du vendredi saint Arthur, revenant de Belgique, rejoignit là les siens.

We are expected to believe from this that Rimbaud was in Charleville in February and March 1873. But it is highly improbable that, having gone back to Charleville in December 1872 and having returned to London on Verlaine's request in January 1873—these two facts are certain—he went back to Charleville in February, remained there all through March, was back in London for 25 March and again in France on 11 April, Good Friday. Further, the description of the arrival of Arthur at his mother's country cottage, given by Vitalie Rimbaud in her *Journal (Mercure de France)*, is not that of someone who has been absent for only a few days and who has come to join his family who have gone to the country ahead of him. It is that of someone who has come back from afar and whom the family were not expecting. Vitalie writes (Good Friday, 11 April):

Ce jour là devait faire époque dans ma vie, car il fut marqué d'un incident qui me toucha particulièrement; sans en être pour ainsi dire prévenue, l'arrivée de mon second frère vint mettre un comblé à notre joie. Je me vois encore dans notre chambre, où nous restions habituellement, occupée à ranger quelques affaires; ma mère, mon frère [her elder brother Frédéric] et ma soeur étaient auprès de moi, lorsqu'un coup discret retentit à la porte. J'allai ouvrir et... jugez de ma surprise, je me trouvai face à face avec Arthur. Les premiers moments d'étonnement passés, le nouveau venu nous explique l'objet de cet événement; nous en fûmes joyeux, et lui bien content de nous voir satisfaits. La journée se passa dans l'intimité de la famille et dans la connaissance de la propriété qu'Arthur ne connaissait presque pas pour ainsi dire.

Furthermore, Verlaine, in the full letters which he wrote to his friends in France from London, mentions Rimbaud's departure of December 1872 and his return the following month, but does not mention any further departure in February. It is very improbable that he would not have referred to it if it had in fact happened.

What is likely is that Rimbaud left London in April in company with Verlaine because he could not live in England without his friend's financial help.

Verlaine fled hurriedly from London early in April because his friends in Paris had told him that his wife was about to start legal proceedings to obtain her separation from him. He was afraid to go directly to France in case he was arrested on account of the part he had played during the Commune, so he went to Belgium, from where he wrote to his friend Lepelletier on 15 April:

Paris et la France me sont dangereux. Un essai de voyage par Newhaven m'a surabondamment prouvé cette triste vérité, et je n'ai dû qu'à un hasard, providentiel, oserais-je dire, et à une conversation en *Anglais de Cuisine entendue sur le bateau une heure avant le départ*, de ne pas gémir actuellement dedans la belle France, dessus la paille non moins humide que préventative des cachots de la République.

A poem by Verlaine, *Beams from Les Romances sans Paroles*, dated *Douvres-Ostendes, à bord de la Comtesse de Flandre, 4 avril 1873*, gives us the exact date of his arrival in Belgium. It is very likely that Rimbaud accompanied him and that, after a week in Belgium, he returned to his family at Roche, a village across the frontier in France, and arrived there on Good Friday, 11 April. The poor state of his health, described by Paterne Berrichon (*Jean-Arthur Rimbaud, le Poète*, p. 229), attributing it wrongly to the months of February and March, is that in which we know he started the composition of *Une Saison en Enfer* in April and May 1873. His impaired health may be due to excesses with Verlaine in Belgium, and that may explain why he left him to return unannounced to his family. The trips to Belgium which Paterne Berrichon stated were made to look for a publisher, again placing them too early, were those which Rimbaud made to meet Verlaine secretly. We know, from Verlaine's letters to his friends in France and from Rimbaud's letters to Verlaine, that they did in fact meet on several occasions. It is probable that Rimbaud told his family that he was going to Belgium to find a publisher—he was known to be composing a literary work—for he tried to keep from them all knowledge of his relationship with Verlaine.

In May 1873 Verlaine and Rimbaud left once more for London. The events which culminated in Rimbaud's abandonment of Verlaine and in the Brussels drama when Verlaine shot at Rimbaud, wounding him, are well known. I have nothing further to add to what I related in *Arthur Rimbaud*.

In 1874 Rimbaud was again in England, this time with Germain Nouveau. They lived together in a furnished room in Stamford Street, a sordid street, poorer than Howland Street where he had lived with Verlaine.

Since his last visit to London Rimbaud seems to have lost his reader's card for the British Museum—perhaps he burned it in the holocaust of November 1873, when he destroyed all his papers and manuscripts. In any case with Germain Nouveau he made a fresh request for a ticket. This time he signed the register with the names *Jean Nicolas Joseph-Arthur Rimbaud*. The name Joseph tacked on to Arthur is puzzling, since it appears neither on his birth nor baptism certificates.

We do not know in what manner Germain Nouveau and Rimbaud occupied their time, nor how they earned their living, since they were both without means. Paterne Berrichon, Mme Méléra and Houn and Bourguignon all say that they earned their living by giving French lessons. Professor Carré was told, verbally, by Delahaye that they were employed in a cardboard-box factory.

We know that Rimbaud fell ill in the month of June and that his mother, after putting her youngest child Isabelle as a boarder in the Convent of the Saint-Sépulcre at Charleville, went over to London with her eldest daughter Vitalie to discover for herself the state of her son's health and also to oblige him to take up regular work. Rimbaud rented for them a room at No. 12 Argyle Square, a finely built house looking out on the square. It was a better locality than Stamford Street. 'Sous les fenêtres de notre appartement', wrote Vitalie to her sister (unpublished letter 7 July belonging to M. Matarasso), 'il y a une infinité de fleurs ombragées par des arbres énormes.'

Vitalie tells us in her *Journal* that her mother had, on Arthur's request, brought with her her best clothes, her grey silk dress and her Chantilly lace mantle, 'afin de pouvoir se présenter avec lui bien habillée comme référence d'honorabilité'.

In Vitalie's *Journal* we have an account of the visit to London of Arthur's mother and sister. We learn that he conducted them on tours of the capital, though he seems to have spent most of his time at the British Museum. He was, besides,

looking for a post which he could not find. Vitalie's sentimental and childish reflexions on London and on English life are not very exciting reading. What emerges most clearly from her diary is her longing to leave England and to return home, her irritation against her brother who, by not finding a job, forces her to remain in exile. At times she has the grace to feel ashamed of her impatience and she tries to conquer it. The *Journal* is full of sentimental regrets for Charleville, expressions of despair at her long and enforced stay in England. According to Vitalie, Rimbaud is forever getting letters which offer him posts, but the offers never seem to come to anything. On 11 July he receives a letter, probably from an agency, since it contains the possibility of three posts.

Je suis contente et pour lui et pour nous [writes Vitalie in *Journal*, p. 27]. Car plus vite il trouvera à se caser, plus vite nous rentrerons en France. J'ai beau trouver Londres magnifique, je m'ennuie.

But these hopes are again disappointed, since on 16 July Rimbaud is still without a job. 'Rien pour Arthur', she writes on that day. 'Oh ! si pourtant il allait être placé. S'il ne trouve rien ce sera bien malheureux. Maman est si triste, si renfermée.'

On 18 July, Rimbaud put a fresh lot of advertisements in the papers and applied to another agency. With so many disappointments Vitalie was beginning to have doubts of her brother's good faith.

Des places il en a. S'il avait voulu il serait placé et nous serions parties aujourd'hui. Oh ! quand je pense que cette joie-là aurait pu être la mienne en ce moment.

But she adds, somewhat ashamed of her annoyance,

Après tout, aurais-je pu trouver grand plaisir à partir, après avoir été témoin du chagrin et des supplications d'Arthur ? Maman dit : encore huit jours. Et voilà ! J'étais dépitée et contente à la fois. Contentée pour Arthur. Bah ! pour lui, j'en prends mon parti tout de même.

During this week Rimbaud, according to his sister, became gloomier and more morose, more irritable. At last on the 29th, as he went out in the morning, he said that he would not return to lunch. At ten o'clock, however, he came back saying that he had at last found a job and that he was leaving next day.

His mother and sister spent the day shopping for themselves and for him. However, in the end he did not leave on the 30th, but only on the 31st, for the laundress had not brought back his washing.

He finally left on 31 July at half-past four in the morning. He seemed sadder than ever, and his mother was in tears after his departure.

Why was he so sad on leaving and why did his mother, who ought to have been pleased that he had found work at last, cry so much as she wrote letters when he had gone ? And where did he go so early in the morning ? All the early biographers state that he went to take up a post at a school in Scotland. Houin and Bourguignon write (*Revue des Ardennes et d'Argonne*, sept.-oct. 1897) : 'Vers le mois de juillet 1874, à la suite d'une maladie qui nécessita la venue et les soins de sa mère il quitta Londres pour séjourner en Écosse.' Professor Carée heard, verbally, from Delahaye that he went to Scotland, while Mme Méléra, who was in touch with Isabelle Rimbaud, wrote (*Rimbaud*, p. 124) :

Le jour où Arthur conduit à la gare de Victoria sa mère et sa sœur retournant aux Ardennes, lui-même vêtu de neuf, un peu d'argent en poche, prend le train pour l'Écosse ; dans une école des environs de Glasgow il sera professeur de français. Engagement d'un an. Et durant l'été de 1874, repris par l'attrait des grandes promenades il parcourait à pied les collines écossaises.

The errors of this passage are easy to refute. First, Rimbaud did not see his mother and sister off at Victoria Station since he left before them. Secondly, he did not stay a year in Scotland since we know he was in Germany in February 1875, and it is hoped that this article will prove that he was at Reading in November 1874 at all events, and perhaps even earlier.

It is hard to find a reason to explain Rimbaud's very early start, if it was to Scotland that he went. In July 1874 there was no train for Scotland as early as half-past four. It is true that half-past four is the hour he left the house. After six in the morning there were several trains for Scotland. The most probable were the two fast trains. The 6.25 from Euston arrived in Glasgow at five o'clock in the afternoon and at Edinburgh at a quarter past six. The ten o'clock train from King's Cross, the best in the day, arrived at Edinburgh at seven o'clock in the evening and at Glasgow at 9.5. Rimbaud might have preferred the first train if he wished to arrive in Scotland early in the afternoon. But why did he leave at half-past four, since it was only ten minutes' walk from his house to Euston? Whom could he have been seeing at that hour in the morning?

All the schools in Glasgow and Edinburgh and in their vicinity were approached in an endeavour to discover any trace of Rimbaud, but all in vain. It is true that if he had accepted a post *au pair* his name would not appear on a list of the regular teachers.

An advertisement was published in the principal daily papers of Scotland inquiring whether there was any one who remembered a young French teacher called Rimbaud in Scotland in 1874. But the advertisements remained without any answer.

Since no information was forthcoming, the trail in Scotland had to be abandoned.

After Verlaine's death, amongst his papers was discovered the draft of an advertisement in Rimbaud's hand, which ran as follows:

A French gentleman (20) of high literary and linguistic (ability) social and entertaining in conversation, will be glad to accompany gentleman (artist preferred) or a family wishing to travel to southern and eastern countries. A.R. 165 King's Road Reading.

In the catalogue of the Maggs' exhibition of autographs in Paris in 1937, where this advertisement was shown, the caption which accompanied it said: 'Annonce autographe au crayon de la main de Rimbaud corrigée par Verlaine.'

Since the advertisement was always alleged to have been corrected by Verlaine, and since it was discovered amongst his papers, it was natural to believe that this advertisement was drawn up during the period when he and Rimbaud were together in London, that is to say, some time between September 1872 and July 1873. This assumption led me to a mistaken conjecture in my work on Rimbaud (*Arthur Rimbaud*, p. 226). I had, up to the time of the publication of my book, not discovered the advertisement in any paper, though I had searched through all the London daily papers for that period. I came to the conclusion that Rimbaud must merely have entertained the idea of putting the advertisement in a paper but had not carried through his project. Later I determined to try to discover why Rimbaud had given an address at Reading, since he was at that time living in London. I came, erroneously, to the conclusion that he had had his correspondence addressed to the house of a friend so that Verlaine should not discover his plans for going abroad. But this conclusion would not be valid if the advertisement had really been corrected by Verlaine.

I determined to investigate matters in Reading. In those days provincial directories were not published every year, and in the British Museum I could only find the directories for 1869 and 1877. The year 1877 gave the occupier of 165 King's Road, Reading, as a certain Camille Le Clair, B.A. But his name did not appear as the tenant in the directory of 1869. It seemed to me fitting that this Camille Le Clair, probably a Frenchman, should be Rimbaud's friend. I wrote to the Town Hall, Reading, to discover who was the occupier of 165 King's Road in 1872 and 1873. The Town Clerk answered that it was a Mr William Hall. This seemed to demolish my theory, but I determined, nevertheless, to discover what I could about Camille Le Clair. The Town Clerk at Reading informed me that he had gone to live at King's Road in 1874 and that he had remained there until 1880.

28 April 1938

Dear Madam,

I am in receipt of your letter of yesterday's date. A search of the rate books and burgess rolls has been made between the years 1871 and 1882. It would appear from the rate books that the man to whom you refer came to reside at 165 King's Road, Reading, during the year 1874 and that he left during 1880 as the house was vacant in 1881. For the first few years his name was entered as Camille Le Clair but in 1880 as Camille Le Clear. His name first appears on the burgess roll for the year commencing November 1878 and appears for the years 1879 and 1880. His name is entered as Camille Le Clear for these three years.

Since it was necessary for my theory that Camille Le Clair should have lived in King's Road, Reading, at latest during the summer of 1873, I imagined that perhaps the house had been sublet to him by Mr William Hall, or that he had merely been a lodger there. It was necessary now to discover all that could be discovered about M. Camille Le Clair.

At the Public Library at Reading I found an advertisement in a Guide to the city which showed that he had been a teacher of French at the Kendrick School in 1877. Further investigations revealed that this school was founded only in 1877.

Research into the registers of the British Museum proved that he had applied for a reader's ticket in September 1885 signing his name as Camille William Henry Le Clair. The anglicization of his Christian names suggested that he might have taken out British naturalization papers. Investigation into the archives of the Home Office proved, however, that this was not the case. Although he seems to have settled definitively in England, he kept his French nationality.

Research into university records showed that he was a graduate of no British university and so the B.A. that he attached to his name probably only refers to the French *baccalauréat*.

Next I looked for traces of him in local Reading papers and finally I came on his tracks. From the month of December 1872 Camille Le Clair was advertising in the *Reading Mercury*, offering to give lessons in French language and literature.

French Language.
Monsieur Camille Le Clair.

Professor of the French language and literature, attends schools and families in Reading and its neighbourhood. Private lessons given and classes held at his Residence. The terms on application at M. C. Le Clair's residence

8 Russell Terrace, Reading.

This proves that in December 1872, Camille Le Clair had not yet gone to live at 165 King's Road. The same advertisement appeared every week in January 1873, but with a new address, this time 31 Russell Square. At the end of the month the

advertisement suddenly ceased appearing. It is not known what happened to M. Le Clair. Perhaps he took up a post as resident teacher in a school.

In August 1873 the advertisement began to appear again. But he had not yet gone to live at King's Road, for he asks for his correspondence to be addressed care of a bookseller. This advertisement continued to appear until the end of September. Then there is nothing until December.

We have now reached a time beyond the date of the break between Verlaine and Rimbaud. Since July Verlaine had been in prison in Belgium and Rimbaud was in France. But I did not abandon the search, for I felt that Camille Le Clair was a more likely friend for Rimbaud to have had than the respectable British-sounding William Hall. In December, Le Clair advertised that he was going to start new French courses.

French Language.
Monsieur Camille Le Clair.
(Graduate of the University of France.)
Professor of the
French Language and Literature.

Has much pleasure in announcing that in consequence of his increased engagements in Reading and its Neighbourhood, he has now made Reading his permanent residence. Private lessons given. Candidates prepared for the various Appointments. Classes held at Monsieur Le Clair's residence, where terms and particulars can be obtained on application,

37, Waylen Street, Reading.

In the January advertisement he added that he was a teacher of French at the school of the Rev. Stephen Hawtrey, Saint Mark's School, Windsor, at the school of the Rev. F. Rutley, The Queen's School, Basingstoke.

The advertisement continued to appear until July 1874, becoming more and more important. He advertised also courses of commercial French, and classes for ladies. All the advertisements gave the same address, 37 Waylen Street, Reading. At last, on 25 July 1874, he advertised a change of address and said that he was going to settle definitively at Montpellier House, 165 King's Road, Reading. After that the following advertisement appeared every week:

Monsieur Camille Le Clair (Graduate of the University of France). Professor of the French Language and Literature, attends Schools and Families. Private lessons given. Morning and evening classes held at his residence Montpellier House, 165 King's Road Reading. Removed from Waylen Street.

Later he added to the advertisement the following passage:

French Classes for Ladies. Mons. Camille Le Clair begs to announce that in addition to the Graduate Classes held at his residence, he has formed a Finishing Class for Advanced Pupils, which will commence on the 18th. January. Particulars can be obtained at Mons. Le Clair's residence, Montpellier House, 165 King's Road Reading.

Having now discovered the exact date of Camille Le Clair's arrival at King's Road, Reading, one of two possibilities had to be accepted. Either that William Hall was the person with whom Rimbaud had had dealings, or else that he had drafted the advertisement after his break with Verlaine, after July 1873. The second possibility seemed to me the more likely, and I began to search in the main daily papers after the month of July 1874, after the arrival of Camille Le Clair at King's Road. Finally success rewarded my efforts. The following advertisement was discovered in *The Times* for 9 November 1874, the advertisement I was looking for:

A Parisian (20) of high literary and linguistic attainments, excellent conversation, will be glad to accompany a Gentleman (Artist preferred) or a family wishing to travel in southern or eastern countries. Good references. A.R. No. 165 King's Road Reading.

How the rough draft of this advertisement in Rimbaud's hand, which appeared in an English paper when Verlaine was in prison in Belgium, fell into the hands of the latter remains a mystery. At all events it is not possible that the advertisement was, as stated in the Maggs' catalogue, corrected by Verlaine. It is true that Verlaine's writing has often been mistaken for Rimbaud's. Copies of poems proved now to be in Verlaine's hand have been sold as Rimbaud autographs, and Isabelle Rimbaud herself once mistook Verlaine's writing for that of her brother. It is possible that the converse might also happen. It is possible that the rough draft was kept by Germain Nouveau who was in England with Rimbaud in 1874 and that he later gave it to Verlaine—they were eventually to become friends. But this is only conjecture.

It has been impossible to discover how and where Camille Le Clair and Rimbaud met, or at what moment Rimbaud went to Reading. But it is significant that Camille Le Clair's advertisement was appearing in the *Reading Mercury* in July 1874 when Rimbaud was so desperately on the look-out for a post. Montpellier House, where Le Clair was about to settle, is a fine three-storied house in a good locality of Reading. It is unlikely that he would be able to occupy it entirely for residential purposes. It is possible that he intended to make of it a kind of French Institute, since he was proposing to hold there classes in French, and that he would need the help of other teachers to deal with all the work he was advertising. It is possible that he engaged Rimbaud at an agency in London, at the time he was advertising in the *Reading Mercury*.

It may have been to Reading that Rimbaud departed early in the morning on 31 July 1874. Perhaps he was obliged to leave so early because he ought to have gone the previous day—we know that he was delayed because his washing had not been sent back. To be in Reading before nine o'clock he would have had to take the six o'clock train from Paddington or the 6.23 from King's Cross. The first reached Reading at 6.55 and the second at 7.45. The Paddington train would have been the more likely one to take, and if he had gone on foot from Argyle Square to Paddington it would not have been too early to start at half-past four.

On the other hand, it is possible that he went to Scotland for the summer to occupy a holiday post, and that he went to Reading for the autumn term. It has been impossible to discover the exact date of his arrival at Reading. What seems certain is that he was there in November, for it would have been highly improbable if he had, while in Scotland, had his correspondence sent to Reading. It also does not seem likely that he would occupy two scholastic posts in the one term. It appears therefore probable that he was not, as all the biographers allege, a teacher of French in a school in Scotland. If he was, it can only have been for a very short time.

L'Homme aux Semelles de Vent did not, however, long remain happy in his post at Reading, since already in November he was seized once more with his longing to wander elsewhere. The advertisement does not seem to have borne any fruit, for he was back in Charleville for Christmas 1874 and in February he was in Germany.

He never came back again to England.

ENID STARKIE

AN UNKNOWN POEM OF LECONTE DE LISLE: 'UNE NUIT D'ORIENT'

The 'Rennes period' in Leconte de Lisle's career extends from 1837 to 1843. His literary production during the earlier part of this period is well known: it comprises the verses enclosed in his letters of 1838-40 to Rouffet, three or four songs and poems published in the *Foyer* at Rennes and in the *Impartial* and the *Dinannais* at Dinan, and his poems, short stories and critical articles in the *Variété* (1840-1).

But from the last number of the *Variété* (March 1841) there is a curious silence. At the end of 1842 Leconte de Lisle made an abortive attempt to found in Rennes a satirical journal, *Le Scorpion*. We have a letter or two of 1842 from the poet to his uncle Louis Leconte, and half a dozen letters of 1844-5 to his old friend Adamolle. But from March 1841 until the publication in July 1845 of *Hélène*, the first of the *Phalange* poems, he appears to have left not a single poem, scarcely a hint of any literary activity.

The last half of this silence is explained partly by the difficulties of publication in his native island of Bourbon, and partly by the poet's growing disinclination to give his verse to obscure periodicals. But at Rennes he had been less exigent, and it was surprising, in view of his activity from 1838 to 1841 and the large number of semi-literary journals in Brittany to which, as the former editor of the *Variété*, he might have had access, to find no trace of any work of his pen in the years 1841-3. It seemed that a thorough *dépouillement* of all the available Breton periodicals of the relevant years was called for. This task had to be broken off when the *Bibliothèque Nationale* closed its doors on 8 June 1940; at that moment it had resulted in the discovery of one poem of Leconte de Lisle hitherto unknown: *Une Nuit d'Orient*. This poem was published on 23 October 1842 in *L'Espègle, Journal de Littérature et d'Arts, Feuille d'Annonces de Chateaubriant*. It bears, in addition to the signature, the date September 1841. Was it kept for a year by the editor of the *Espiègle*, or was it revised by Leconte de Lisle before publication? In any case, it helps to fill the gap between the *Variété* and the *Phalange*, and it is by far the longest known poem of Leconte de Lisle prior to the *Phalange* period. Its authenticity is beyond doubt. It is signed 'T. (sic) Leconte de Lisle'; it is dated from Rennes; it has a Bourbon setting. Moreover, the editor of the *Espiègle*, one Émile Langlois, a solicitor at Rennes, is no other than the Langlois mentioned in Leconte de Lisle's letters to Rouffet as an editor of the *Foyer* and 'un bon garçon'. From passing allusions in various numbers of the *Espiègle* it would seem that Leconte de Lisle was, at the time, more or less 'articled' to Langlois in deference to his father's wish that he should acquire practical experience of his future profession. A long letter purporting to have been written by a father in Bourbon to his erring son in Rennes, an epistle full of anguished admonitions and paternal perturbation, seems to be the burlesque of letters written by Leconte de Lisle senior to his son.

The *Espiègle* died during 1843 after a prolonged and venomous polemic with its rival, *L'Écho des Bois*, also published at Chateaubriant. Langlois disappeared, leaving debts behind him. A versatile writer of no mean talent, he had filled a large proportion of the columns of the *Espiègle* with his own productions. It is not improbable, however, that Leconte de Lisle published in the *Espiègle* a number of stories or fantastic trifles which he did not care to sign.

Une Nuit d'Orient I publish without comment. It is not as a great poem, or even as a good poem, but as a 'poème retrouvé' that it has a genuine interest.

Une Nuit d'Orient

I

Les doux musiciens de l'air avaient chanté,
 Les montagnes dormaient d'un sommeil enchanté,
 Semblables aux reines de l'ombre;
 Sur les bords parfumés et les flots assoupis
 Le ciel arrondissait sa voûte de rubis,
 Dont nul n'a deviné le nombre.

Autour des tamarins et des palmiers penchés,
 Dans leurs nids odorants quelques sylphes cachés
 Riaient en notes étouffées,
 Comme s'ils eussent vu, dans le feuillage obscur,
 Pareil aux gazes d'or qui luisent dans l'azur,
 Etinceler l'aile des fées.

L'arbre, la fleur, l'étoile, ensemble et tour à tour,
 Se parlaient un langage ignoré du grand jour,
 Concert qui flotte en doux murmures,
 Qui soupire et qui passe, et fait, durant la nuit,
 Un de ces bruits rêveurs que l'oiseau qui s'enfuit
 Laisse après lui dans les ramures.

Les grands bois suspendus entre les flots et l'air
 Jetaient sur les glaciers brillants comme l'éclair
 Une écharpe d'ombres timides;
 Et la mer, dilatant ses immenses poumons,
 Argentait lentement le pied des vastes monts,
 De ses mille baisers humides.

Les deux bras de la nuit, dans le calme et le feu,
 Pressaient avec amour l'œuvre sainte de Dieu,
 Que son souffle puissant balance;
 La vague déroulait sur le sable un bruit vain,
 Et l'homme, délivré par le sommeil divin,
 Rêvait des cieux pleins de silence.

C'était l'heure profonde où l'ange de Dieu seul
 Soulève de la nuit le radieux linceul,
 Et regarde d'un œil de flamme.
 Une pirogue prise au tronc d'un tamarin,
 Sur le corail glissant fendit l'azur marin,
 Et laissa du feu sur la lame.

Elle voguait légère, avec un doux roulis,
 Penchant sa proue aiguë, et par bonds assouplis
 Formant des cercles sur l'eau bleue,
 Comme les grands poissons, sous les feux de midi,
 Qui plongent et tournoient, et du flot attiédi
 Creusent le cristal de leur queue.

Puis, se livrant, docile, aux caresses des flots,
 Elle arrêta son vol, et prit ses matelots
 Dans son repos plein d'indolence;
 Et sous les vastes cieux semés d'yeux jaloux [sic]
 L'Océan immobile, éblouissant et doux,
 Retomba dans un grand silence.

Le coude sur le bord de son esquif berçant,
 Une femme rêvait, mi-couchée; et, baissant
 Son beau front dans sa main charmante,
 Entourait du regard de son amour joyeux
 Un homme assis près d'elle, et qui portait les yeux
 De l'étoile à la mer dormante.

Cette femme était jeune et pleine de beauté.
 Ses lèvres souriaient, et son front abrité
 Sous ses doigts effilés et roses,
 Laissait couler autour de son visage aimé
 Un flot de cheveux blonds, plus pur, plus embaumé
 Que le souffle divin des roses.
 Pour lui, le cœur gonflé de délire et d'amour,
 Il semblait résumer sa vie en un seul jour!
 Baisers de sa mère qu'il pleure,
 Folles illusions, rêves, nobles élans.
 Oh! qu'avait-il touché de ses désirs brûlants
 De plus enchanté que cette heure!
 Oh! rien!—Pensif aux pieds de cet être adoré,
 Seul baiser ce beau front que le ciel a doré!
 Boire le parfum de sa lèvre!
 Contempler ces regards où ses regards perdus
 Echangeant l'un dans l'autre, unis et confondus,
 Les pleurs d'une céleste fièvre!
 Oh! c'était, loin du monde et d'un moqueur dédain,
 S'abreuver de délire aux fleuves de l'Eden,
 bercé par les ailes du rêve!
 C'était, loin de la terre et des sentiers maudits,
 Avec des chants joyeux rouvrir le paradis
 Et s'éveiller près d'une autre Eve!
 Or, le vent sommeillait au fond du large nid
 Qu'il s'est creusé jadis aux gorges du granit,
 Comme autrefois l'autre d'Eole;
 Mais un nuage blanc, à l'horizon lointain,
 Vers sa base assombri, portait un front hautain
 Ceint d'une éclatante auréole.

II

Première voix

Soulève ta paupière! et dans le fond des cieux
 Où sont les astres d'or, frères de tes beaux yeux,
 Ne vois-tu pas, ma bien aimée,
 Nos deux anges gardiens qui veulent nous parler,
 Et brûlent du regard, pour nous mieux contempler,
 La nuit limpide et parfumée?
 Dis-moi, ma douce fée, entendrais-tu leurs voix?
 Que ton accent est doux comme un souffle des bois,
 Quand le soir endort la nature!...
 Serait-ce eux qui t'ont faite un écho de leurs chants,
 Et qui dorent tes traits sublimes et touchants,
 O rayonnante créature?
 O parle! de ta voix épanche le doux miel!
 Mon cœur brille à ta voix comme un palais du ciel,
 Et n'a rien qui ne t'appartienne!
 O mon âme! dis-moi quelque mot enchanté!
 Ma vie est ton reflet, ô ma douce beauté!
 Mon âme est l'ombre de la tienne!

Deuxième voix

Mon bien-aimé! je rêve à notre amour, j'ai peur!
 Oh! nous sommes heureux! Mais s'il était trompeur
 Ce moment d'enivrant délire!
 Oh! s'il devait passer, et sans un souvenir,
 Comme le chant qui sort, pour ne plus revenir,
 Des cordes frêles de la lyre!

Belle nuit! voûte pure! abîme étincelant!
 Flots divins, répétés par chaque flot tremblant
 Qui pétille sous la lumière!
 O célestes beautés! vous passeriez aussi;
 Mais Dieu sait réveiller son palais obscurci,
 Lui rendre sa gloire première!
 O mon amour! mourir mes mains entre tes mains!
 Mourir seuls avec Dieu, loin des rires humains,
 Dans l'amour et la solitude!
 Mourir dans un baiser, mourir avec la foi,
 Mon cœur contre ton cœur, les yeux fixés sur toi,
 Sans pleurs et sans inquiétude!...
 Ce destin serait doux! et tandis que la mer
 Roulerait dans les plis de son empire amer
 Nos corps que le trépas enlace,
 De nos anges gardiens suivant le vol au ciel,
 Nos deux âmes seraient aux pieds de l'Eternel,
 Avant que leur aile fût lasse!

Première voix

Pourquoi jeter ton âme en ces tristes pensées?
 Oh! puisque tu permets qu'à mes brûlants baisers
 Ta main se livre, douce et blanche;
 Puisque ta lèvre rose à ma lèvre s'unit,
 Puisque nous nous berçons comme en un chaste nid
 Que Dieu suspend sous une branche!
 Puisque la mer sommeille en rêvant de son roi,
 Que les poissons joyeux font luire sans effroi
 L'éclair des nageoires dorées;
 Que le dôme celeste, immense et merveilleux,
 Jette comme un prodigue, au milieu des flots bleus,
 Les constellations sacrées!
 Puisque dans les ravins les lianes d'argent
 S'enlacent maintenant sur le bassin changeant
 Que rident leurs touffes fleuries;
 Que l'horizon de feu, ce voile radieux,
 Entre l'éclat des flots et la flamme des cieux
 Tend ses flottantes draperies!...
 Oh! laisse ton sourire illuminer mon cœur!
 O ma vie! aimons-nous, rêvons, chantons en chœur
 La nature immense et sublime,
 Ce manteau sidéral que Dieu créa pour lui,
 Dieu qui fit notre amour, et qui berce aujourd'hui
 Notre bonheur sur un abîme!

Deuxième voix

O mon doux paradis! mon beau pays natal!
 O montagnes! ô mer d'azur et de cristal!
 Parfums, brises, blondes étoiles!
 Creux profonds où l'on voit passer l'ombre de Dieu,
 Nature, temple saint, qui te couvres de feu
 Comme de resplendissants voiles!
 Vous m'éblouissez l'âme!—Oh! viens, mon bien-aimé,
 Viens, respirons à deux le sourire embaumé
 Que nous jettent d'en haut les anges!
 Unissons notre cœur dans un hymne d'amour,
 Avec les mille voix de la nuit, tour à tour
 Faisons d'harmonieux échanges!

Oublions, oublions! Au délire divin,
 O mon doux bien-aimé! n'opposons point en vain
 La sombre peur des jours funestes;
 Comme un vase sacré d'ivresse débordant,
 Epanchons notre vie ainsi qu'un flot ardent,
 Au sein de ces heures célestes!

III

Tandis qu'avec amour ils se parlaient ainsi,
 Par-delà l'horizon le nuage obscurci
 Envahissait la nuit d'opale;
 Et les astres atteints par l'ombre du géant
 S'éteignaient dans les cieux comme sur l'Océan,
 Autour de la déesse pâle.

Sur l'immobile mer passait un souffle épais
 Qui troublait par moments l'universelle paix
 De bruits intérieurs et vagues.
 Dans le nuage noir de longs roulements sourds,
 De la hauteur des airs amoncelés et lourds,
 Trouvaient un écho sur les vagues.

La montagne surprise éveillait ses grands bois,
 Qui déjà remuaient avec de sombres voix
 La masse de leurs fortes branches;
 Et les flots, se heurtant bientôt contre le roc,
 L'un sur l'autre pressés, firent jaillir du choc
 Sur ses flancs noirs des gerbes blanches!

Elancé du fourreau, comme un glaive sanglant,
 Un rouge éclair fendit l'horizon chancelant,
 Et brûla l'Océan livide!
 Et l'Océan, tout plein d'un orageux courroux,
 Se proclama, du fond de ses puissants remous,
 Dans un rugissement avide!

Le vent précipité par larges tourbillons
 Labourait les flots blancs de palpitants sillons,
 Qu'il disperse en humide poudre;
 Et de la grève ardente à la cime des bois,
 Sur son aile qui gronde emportait à la fois
 Les triples flèches de la foudre!

En proie à l'ouragan qui la secoue aux airs,
 Au tonnerre divin qui la perce d'éclairs,
 En proie au flot qui mord et tue...
 Exhalant par deux fois un long gémissement,
 La pirogue s'en vint, sur le sable écumant,
 Rouler sa carène abattue!

Or, repliant sa crête en des arceaux mouvants,
 Une houle accourut, avec l'effort des vents
 Qu'un écho strident accompagne...
 Et sur les corps verdis, raides, sanglants, hideux,
 Elle éclata soudain, et les couvrit tous deux
 De la chute d'une montagne!

T.¹ LECONTE DE LISLE.*Rennes, Septembre 1841.*

F. L. JONES

THE ANATOMY OF VIRTUE

In English we have reduced the word *virtue* to one main sense, and to this sense of conformity to moral principles all other senses are subordinate, or else are obsolescent. That simplicity of use, which is not affected by differences between abstract and concrete, makes us perhaps a little insensitive to the possibility of other employment for the word. We can distinguish with ease between virtue and virtuosity because the words no longer seem connected. Nor do objects of vertu (a monopoly of sale catalogues) disturb us. But the spectacle of the word *virtue* with an obviously divergent sense from our own is enough to cause misgiving. And indeed, no word in Machiavelli's vocabulary has aroused more excitement, and more indignation, than the simple word *virtù*. For those who know no more of this author than his reputation the notion that he abandoned virtue to put in its place some pagan conception of *virtù* replaces the need for documentation on his quality as a writer: it represents concrete, and detailed, proof of his wickedness. An author who has no concern for virtue must be immoral or amoral (the former being the old-fashioned, the latter the more modern, view of Machiavelli). And for many there has seemed no need to consider the case of Machiavelli more closely when he had revealed his colours so clearly. There have been, of course, excuses for such an attitude. Although many have written on Machiavelli, few have examined the values he attaches to words. Ercole, who (apart from the useful annotations of editors such as Lisio) stands almost alone in this examination, has shown that there is much to learn on Machiavelli's vocabulary generally. But his work is recent, and in the matter of *virtù* not very complete. As a basis for examination of this perhaps Ercole's conclusions on the Machiavellian use of *stato* are the most helpful. *Stato* has a whole gamut of meanings, ranging from the Latin one of *state*, *condition*, to something very near the modern conception of the *State*; but with a general tendency to convey something less than this last, *power*, *those that hold it*, *government*, rather than *territory*—though this last is not absent.¹ In any given passage the word *stato*—such is the uncertainty of Machiavelli's use of it—may have any one of this range of shades. And this unscientific use of terms is not untypical of Machiavelli. He is so much more concerned with things than with words that his symbols may be inadequate. His vision of things is, as has been generally recognized, astonishingly sharp; and as a consequence of that very sharpness, his notation of them is at times misleading.

Such a point of departure for the consideration of *virtù* would not seem to lead to a doctrine based on this word. Yet it has been a fairly general belief that such a doctrine existed, and that to the exclusion of the meaning *virtue*. Even this certainty as to the existence of a blind spot in Machiavelli's make-up (and, by one of those inviting side-steps, in the Renaissance as well. Is it not the Age of Machiavelli, or of Aretine?) has seemed sufficiently well known to need only a passing allusion to it. Thus Woodward, in his novel about Caesar Borgia, wrote: 'For what in the days of the Borgia was legitimacy in comparison with force, with personal distinction, with *virtù*?'² It is clear, from such a question, that the individuality of the word is taken for granted, and felt as giving a dubious air not only to its author, but to his times as well. One does not call the Renaissance 'the days of the Borgia' without conveying a slur of some sort: and this slur spreads from the conception of *virtù*. *Elena* was the unsuccessful divagation of a scholar; but scholars in their own field have said much the same. Einstein remarked on Elizabethan borrowing from

¹ Francesco Ercole, *La Politica di Machiavelli* (1926), p. 65.

² W. H. Woodward, *Elena* (1929), p. 18.

Machiavelli, noting it as often from the pseudo-Machiavelli: 'Nevertheless, it can scarcely be doubted that Machiavelli's doctrine of *virtù* fitted in with the ideas of the age'.¹ Praz wrote of 'quella dottrina pagana di virtù'.² Gentile quoted Burckhardt's definition of the Machiavellian *virtù* as an 'unione di forza e di talento, e che certamente si può definire anche soltanto forza, e per forza s' intende non forza meccanica, ma umana. volontà (e quindi forza di talento)'.³ Ercole himself, in spite of his habit of examining the variations in Machiavelli's use of words, talked of the rise of 'il concetto della virtù machiavellesca',⁴ and in a later work, where his criticism of Machiavelli has been wholly overlaid by a Fascist gloss (was not Mussolini's so-called thesis on Machiavelli merely a crib from Ercole's earlier work?), he presents the definition of the word in two stages. Basically, it is the 'esercizio concreto della libertà propria dell' uomo di energico e conscio volere, non già di fermare a sua posta o di deviare a suo arbitrio il corso della realtà, tra cui vive e che lo circonda, ma di piegarlo in modo da imporgli l'impronta della propria azione... non soltanto a volere un fine, ma anche ad agire per tradurlo nella realtà'.⁵ This, then, is purely utilitarian if it is made to serve private ends, the good of the individual; it becomes moral, at least for Machiavelli, when it serves something transcending this, not for mere 'proprio libito, ma per un dovere che annulla ogni libito'—that is, for one's country. Hence *virtù* is either good or bad according to its application; but in any case it is the privilege of the very few.⁶ Such language is more ambitious, and it has the vice of building a general theory on a particular statement of Machiavelli; but it is only in this rider that it modifies accepted ideas.

I do not know of anyone after Ercole who has seen fit to examine the problem. The first necessary step is to dismiss the casual statements which imply a doctrine or theory of *virtù* and characterize Machiavelli, or even the Renaissance, thereby. There is no doctrine of *virtù* in Machiavelli. If there were it would be easy to discover in his works; but Machiavelli was not given to such theorizing, and he himself would have been the first to be surprised at the stir the word has caused. The second point is that even if Machiavelli were to use *virtù* as something poles apart from *virtue* that particular would not, in itself, permit the deduction that he was oblivious of the claims, or of the existence, of virtue. To say that Machiavelli uses *virtù* always in an odd sense of his own is a linguistic observation only, unless it is accompanied by a certificate that he has no other word for virtue. But it is quite clear that Machiavelli is not short of words, and normally *buono*, *onesto* with their opposites *cattivo*, *tristo* replace *virtuoso* and *vizioso*. One can hardly be preoccupied with goodness and badness without having some conception of virtue; and there is no moral case that can be based against Machiavelli on the use he makes of *virtù*. But one can go further than this: Machiavelli has not only other words for virtue, but he does not exclusively reserve *virtù* for a pagan (*scilicet*, a Latin) sense. It is exactly here as it was with *stato*: his use of terms is imprecise, and he employs them as they come to cover any of their several acceptations—beginning with what he found in his Latin authors, and ending with current meanings. Tommasini, in noting the influence of Galen on Machiavelli, with a consequent tendency to use medical metaphors, observed that his use of *virtù* was medical also, and that it represented a 'potestas quaedam efficiendi'.⁷ That I believe to be a more helpful annotation than the elaborated theorizing of Ercole. But it is only a single facet of

¹ Lewis Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England* (1905), p. 368.

² Mario Praz, *Storia della Lett. Inglese* (1937), p. 61.

³ Gio. Gentile, *Studi sul Rinascimento*, p. 108.

⁴ Ercole, op. cit. p. 20.

⁵ Ercole, *Pensatori e Uomini d'Azione* (1935), p. 169.

⁶ Ibid. pp. 170-1.

⁷ O. Tommasini, *Vita e Scritti di N.M.* II, 39. And cf. Dante's use of *virtù* in *Purg.* xxv, 41.

the word. Thus there are passages, and by no means solitary ones, in which the acceptation of *virtù* must perforce be that of virtue. To begin with the *Prince*, as the best known of his works, it is plain in this passage that there is no twist to virtue: 'Perché, se si considerà bene tutto, si troverà qualche cosa che parrà virtù, e seguendola sarebbe la ruina sua, e qualcuna altra che parrà vizio, e seguendola ne riesce la securtà et il bene essere suo'.¹ Equally plain are two examples from the *Discorsi*. In the passage contrasting the Roman Empire under a good and a bad emperor Machiavelli sees in the first state of things 'la nobiltà e la virtù esaltata'; in the second he sees innumerable cruelties in Rome 'e la nobiltà, le ricchezze, i passati onori, e sopra tutto la virtù, essere imputate a peccato capitale'.² Later on, in demonstrating that good laws may become bad in changed conditions, he notes that originally in Rome those who deserved magistratures demanded them; but with the passage of time, and the growth of effrontery, the good stood on one side, the bad grasped out for office: 'Non quelli che avevano più virtù, ma quelli che avevano più potenza, domandavano i magistrati; e gl' impotenti, comeché virtuosi, se ne astenevano di domandarli, per paura'.³ This observation is worth noting, because it completely precludes any interpretation of *virtù* in terms of force, energy of the will, or what-have-you. It is unmistakably plain virtue that Machiavelli means.

I do not put forward these few quotations as all in which *virtù* and virtue are synonymous; but as sufficient in themselves to show that Machiavelli, apart from other words which have the same meaning, is not ignorant of virtue in its own colours. Nor, naturally, do I put them forward either as preventing him from using the word elsewhere (even in close proximity) in a different sense. Indeed, it is quite obvious that the idea of a theory of *virtù* could not have arisen were there not conspicuous examples in which *virtù* has a sense akin to, or derived from, that of Galen. Nor are other Latin senses unrepresented. Thus in 'Cose tutte da maravigliarsi come in un esercito così fatto fusse tanta virtù che sapesse vincere, e come nello inimico fusse tanta viltà che da sí disordinate genti potesse essere vinto',⁴ the word is defined by its opposite to give the sense of valour and bravery which Machiavelli found most frequently given to it in his author, Livy. And the *surprise* over a victory by 'disordinate genti' shows that Machiavelli had in mind the contrast between barbaric *furor* and Latin *virtus*. Other opposites, besides *vizio* and *viltà*, stand with *virtù*, and give it relief in specific passages. Thus *ozio* gives a sharp definition in a passage of the *Discorsi*.⁵ Perhaps more frequent still is the opposition with *fortuna*, a pair which Machiavelli had obviously learnt from the Latin historians, from whom so much of his idiom comes. Quintus Curtius, for example, had discussed the question whether Alexander the Great owed more to *virtus* or to *fortuna*;⁶ a question which Machiavelli repeats for Caesar Borgia in ch. vii of the *Prince*. And it is the same Quintus Curtius who defined the word most sharply in the sense that has been proclaimed essentially Machiavellian. When Alexander's soldiers quail before their leader's appetite for conquests, and for jungle penetration, their spokesman says: 'Virtus enim tua semper in incremento erit, nostra vis in fine iam est.'⁷ There is something comparable a few pages earlier, where Porus, at his last gasp, uses his last weapon to transfix his brother Taxilis, who had urged on him surrender to Alexander: 'Hoc ultimo opere virtutis edito fugere acrius coepit.'⁸

¹ *Principe* (*Tutte le Opere*, ed. Mazzoni e Casella), xv, 31.

² *Discorsi* (ed. cit.), i, x, 75.

³ *Ibid.* i, xviii, 87.

⁴ *Istorie Fiorentine* (ed. Plinio Carli, 1927), v, xxxiv, 57.

⁵ *Ibid.* ii, 141.

⁶ Quintus Curtius (Aldus, 1520), x, 160.

⁷ *Ibid.* ix, 138.

⁸ *Ibid.* viii, 132.

Virtue is thus already an energy of the will, transcending mere force. It is a regular Latin sense, and one which is surely implicit still in Cicero's contribution of virtue as moral perfection. 'Est autem virtus nihil aliud quam in se perfecta et ad summum perducta natura.'¹ That is to say, it represents one avenue of development towards a perfection. Where Machiavelli is so often indebted to his Latin authors for construction and vocabulary there is nothing odd in his taking also the various Latin uses of *virtus*, and leaving them concurrent, as he did with *stato*.

In the case of *virtù* there is a further check on the process. I do not think the dictionary recognizes it explicitly, but there is in Latin a gap between *virtus* and *virtutes*. It is the first only that admits the sense of energy of the will, or bravery: the second is concerned with good actions, or good qualities. Thus Valerius Maximus uses *virtus* for Xenophon, who continued sacrificing after hearing news of his son's death, only removing his wreath, which, however, he replaced when he learnt that he died fighting most bravely; showing thus 'maiores se ex virtute filii voluptatem, quam ex morte amaritudinem sentire'.² But he uses *virtutes* differently. Marcus Brutus is 'suorum prius virtutum, quam patriae parentis parricida'.³ The ancient Roman who killed his wife because she had drunk wine found no accuser, and no blame, amongst his contemporaries, who thought she had rightly paid the penalty of violated sobriety: 'et sane quaecunque foemina vini usum immoderate appetit et virtutibus omnibus ianuam claudit et delictis aperit'.⁴ Machiavelli retains this plural when, for instance, he speaks of the prince's duty to 'mostrarsi amatore delle virtù dando recapito alli uomini virtuosi, e onorare gli eccellenti in una arte'.⁵ And this coincidence with the Latin use is sufficient to resolve the ambiguity which Lisio recognized—though he spoke for the good interpretation—in the passage on Hannibal. When Machiavelli writes of 'quella sua inumana crudeltà, la quale insieme con infinite sua virtù lo fece sempre nel conspetto de' sua soldati venerando e terribile',⁶ there is implied a contrast between the qualities, as there is explicit one between the epithets resulting from them. Hannibal is not venerable because of his inhuman cruelty, or terrible because of his virtues. This plural is, I think, rarely used by Machiavelli: there is at least one case where he has replaced a Latin plural by the singular, with the sense of virtue, and this in the passage I quoted on Rome under the bad emperors.⁷ But if it is a rare use, at least it is stable in sense, as it was in Latin.⁸ The singular is more volatile. This ambiguity, however, which leaves the reader with the task of fitting one of the several Latin senses, the medical one, that of energy of the will, of bravery, of Ciceronian virtue, or the post-Latin sense of Christian virtue, can involve no reflection on Machiavelli. Rather, it is clear that there are other elements to Machiavelli's theory of the Prince, or of the republic, than mere go-getting, and that it is not profitable to consider him as a writer without taking them fully into account. Machiavelli is no more the standard-bearer of *virtù* than the Renaissance is the age of the Borgias. That is not to say, of course, that this one aspect of the word is unimportant, or that the Borgia family did not exist. But it does mean that Machiavelli cannot be so simply dismissed as has been customary.

J. H. WHITFIELD

OXFORD.

¹ *De Legibus*, I, viii, 25.

² *Val. Max.* v, x, 5.

³ *Ibid.* vi, iv, 8.

⁴ *Principe*, xxi, 45.

⁵ *Ibid.* (ed. Lisio, 1927), xvii, 100, n. 15.

⁶ Cf. supra, *Discorsi*, I, x, 75. It has not been noticed, I think, that the whole discussion of

⁴ *Ibid.* vi, iii, 10.

Rome under good and bad emperors is taken from Tacitus at the beginning of the First Book of the *Histories*. The corresponding passage here is: 'Nobilitas, opes, omissi gestique honores pro crimine, et ob virtutes certissimum exitium.'

⁸ Cf. the end of *Principe*, xi on Leo X: 'la bontà et infinite altre sua virtù.'

HÖLDERLIN AND SYMBOLISM

IN MEMORIAM
FRIEDRICH HÖLDERLIN

Died 7 June 1843

I

The full recognition of Hölderlin's greatness has been so recent, that even to-day, a hundred years after his death, a knowledge of his poetry is not widespread. The most obvious reason for this neglect lies in the difficulties inherent in his work, that portion of it in particular, in which his mature thought and style are to be found. His poetry is obscure because it is the expression of a mind that lived wholly in a world of its own. This remains true although a careful reading of his work can also show that it is a product of his age, the formative years of German Classicism in poetry and German Idealism in philosophy. It is indeed no easy task to distinguish clearly between those ideas which Hölderlin received from Schiller, Fichte, Hegel and Schelling, and those in which he is entirely original. There is much in his work that bears the stamp of the years during which it was written. But even when this is recognized, it is not possible to claim with certainty that Hölderlin consciously adopted the ideas of others. He lived in one of those ages when the same thoughts occur to different minds independently because the seeds of these thoughts are abroad and the soil is prepared for their growth.

Since it is thus a matter of the utmost difficulty to trace the origins of Hölderlin's ideas, it has been rightly said that the biographical and historical approaches to his work tend to obscure the true nature of his poetry, to deflect attention from it. As a principle of criticism this view is sound and it applies to the work of every poet. But it cannot be taken to exclude the treatment, along chronological lines, of the evolution of Hölderlin's thought in his poetry, since in his case, even more so than in that of others, the work forms a continuous whole. Hölderlin's thought is so immovably centred on the same subjects throughout the whole of his conscious life, and, if we can trust report, even during the earlier stages of his madness, that his work forms an organic entity; so that in each successive stage, except perhaps the earliest, the essential Hölderlin appears. But in each stage there is also a modification of this constant quality; never, it is true, a complete transformation, but always an addition of new facets or the raising of the old into higher relief. There is thus a development of Hölderlin's thought, as revealed in his work, and without a knowledge of it the inner meaning of this work cannot be understood.

The peculiar difficulty, then, that the reader meets in Hölderlin's poetry is first the singular inwardness of his thought, and secondly the fact that his poetry is the expression of a mind continuously occupied with the same fundamental themes and problems. The critic, furthermore, is faced with the task of discovering the appropriate method of displaying the qualities of Hölderlin's poetry. The usual methods do not seem adequate to this end, as the voluminous and authoritative work of W. Böhm proves. The biographical method, however, has been employed most successfully by Bertaux in his book *Hölderlin, essai de biographie intérieure* (1936), a success which may be attributed to the fact that the author has clearly seen the inward character of Hölderlin's development. Paul Böckmann, on the other hand,

in his book *Hölderlin und seine Gotter*, while treating the whole of Hölderlin's work, pays especial attention to a salient feature, the mythopoeic quality of his poetry. Ronald Peacock (*Holderlin*, 1938), discarding the chronological method altogether, sets out to 'provide a background by reference to which his poetry might be more easily approached'. He has 'emphasized certain commanding tendencies of thought and belief, certain persistent preoccupations, which are constantly seeking expression in his poetry'. Peacock has thus cleared the way for an appreciation of Hölderlin's poetry by explaining his thought. He is, moreover, aware of the difficulty in which the compactness of Hölderlin's 'system' of beliefs, its strong centralization, involves the critic: 'for it is impossible to treat one without treating all of them, so closely are they interwoven both logically and in his poetry.' 'It is a difficulty', he adds, 'which I think no method of dealing with Hölderlin can evade.'

One of the most recent books on Hölderlin possesses the merit of finding a way out of this difficulty, though only to some extent. Guardini¹ selects the themes of Hölderlin's belief which are most characteristic of him. But the work lacks uniformity, since Guardini chooses first two symbols (the river and the mountain), then two works (*Hyperion* and *Empedocles*) and finally such subjects as Nature, the Gods, Christ and Christianity, in order to present Hölderlin to us. While this treatise is supremely enlightening in many respects and draws attention to an aspect of Hölderlin's poetry which may be considered of central importance, namely his use of symbols, it tends to confuse the reader by its lack of a unified plan of approach, and by not escaping the pitfall, which Peacock has foreseen, of wearisome repetition.

Mr T. S. Eliot has reminded us of the elusiveness of meaning in poetry and of the difference between understanding and enjoying poetry (*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, 1933). What he says of himself can well be applied to most readers of Hölderlin: 'I know that some of the poetry to which I am most devoted is poetry which I did not understand at first reading; some is poetry which I am not sure I understand yet: for instance, Shakespeare's.' To be aware of the meaning of poetry is not the same as to understand it intellectually. In the case of Hölderlin, whose beliefs are often so little related to those of his readers, it is possible to present a coherent account only of the poetic expression of these beliefs. Criticism of his beliefs, as beliefs, if not beside the point in other connexions, is irrelevant for an understanding of his poetry. Therefore, while his philosophical ideas are interesting in themselves—and indeed Hölderlin, like Schiller, felt the necessity of clarifying his mind, in the interest of his poetry, on important aesthetic and philosophical questions—it is preferable not to seek in them a key to the understanding of his poetry. What matters is Hölderlin's poetic thought, not his thought as such. He was himself aware of the dangers of the poet's preoccupation with philosophy. In a letter to his mother (dated January 1799) he writes:

Aber ich weiss jetzt so viel, dass ich tiefen Unfrieden und Missmut unter anderm auch dadurch in mich gebracht habe, dass ich Beschäftigungen, die meiner Natur weniger angemessen zu sein schienen, z.B. die Philosophie, mit überwiegender Aufmerksamkeit und Anstrengung betrieb und das aus gutem Willen, weil ich vor dem Namen eines leeren Poeten mich fürchtete. (Vol. III, p. 376.)²

Yet it is imperative that we should take into account Hölderlin's aesthetic views. They do offer a key to the understanding of his poetry; not, it is true, because they are a guide to the content of his poetry, but because they indicate the direction of his poetic thought and thus draw our attention to some salient aspects of his poetry.

¹ *Hölderlin. Weltbild und Frömmigkeit*, 1939.

² Quotations (with modernized spelling) are from the Hellingrath edition of Hölderlin's works.

It is, I believe, Hölderlin's symbolism, as it is indicated in some of his theoretical writings, which can thus assist us to an understanding of his poetry itself.

The nature of symbolism, however, must also be known, in order that the meaning of both Hölderlin's theoretical views and his poetry should be made clear. Here we find that modern developments in poetry help us to understand Hölderlin. It is not a coincidence that his poetry began to arouse a real interest only after these developments had become clearly defined. The new perceptions gained by this movement, the realization of new poetic values, have opened the way for the reception of Hölderlin in his own right. I am not thinking in the first place of Stefan George and his followers, who saw in Hölderlin above all the discoverer of Dionysos and Orpheus, the 'Rufer des neuen Gottes' (*Tage und Taten*, pp. 70, 71), a view that claims Hölderlin as a precursor of George himself. George the poet had the right so to claim Hölderlin, but as a principle of critical assessment his view is dangerously misleading. I am thinking rather of the recent valuation through Symbolism of the working of the poet's mind which has given us a guide to the proper (not necessarily intellectual) understanding of some of the poetry that had hitherto remained inaccessible.

It is, then, Hölderlin's use of symbols which, I believe, will enable us to grasp the meaning of his poetry. If we note his symbols, trace their development, and explain their terms of reference, we shall enter the world of his thought without diverting attention from his poetry. For the use of symbols is the expression of *poetic* thought, a realm where ideas are the very essence of the poet's being. The reflective nature of so much of Hölderlin's poetry too easily betrays us into attempting to read it for its thought, content alone. We are then baffled when we find the sequences of his thought incomprehensible, so that, by concentrating on his thought we miss the meaning of his poetry. But if we pay attention in the first place to Hölderlin's symbolism, we shall escape this danger and perhaps be enabled to assess his poetry at its right value.

II

In considering the nature of symbolism in general we may take two definitions of the symbol, one by Hegel, the other by A. N. Whitehead. Hegel (*Ästhetik*, vol. I, p. 420) defines the symbol as 'eine für die Anschauung unmittelbar vorhandene oder gegebene äusserliche Existenz, welche jedoch nicht so wie sie unmittelbar vorliegt, ihrer selbst wegen genommen, sondern in einem weitern und allgemeinem Sinne verstanden werden soll'. Whitehead (*Symbolism, its meaning and effect*, 1928, p. 9) says: 'The human mind is functioning symbolically when some components of its experience elicit consciousness, beliefs, emotions; and usages, respecting other components of its experience. The former set of components are the "symbols", and the latter set constitute the "meaning" of the symbols.'

Hegel emphasizes the concrete nature of the symbol and this is a valuable indication of its poetic quality. But the other postulate which he makes is less valuable in this connexion. He asserts that the symbol is less important than the meaning which attaches to it. This is a misleading view, as far as the realm of art is concerned, for it divorces the concrete presence from its ideal content and thus concentrates attention on the thought-content of the work of art.

Whitehead's definition does not lead us into this error, and indeed in a later passage of his book he says: 'The poet is a person for whom visual sights and sounds and emotional experiences refer symbolically to words. The poet's readers are people for whom his words refer symbolically to the visual sights and sounds and emotions

he wants to evoke' (p. 14). In Hölderlin's poetry, at any rate, the symbol is a reality enshrining within itself the meaning, which belongs indissolubly to its essence. The meaning is not imported consciously by the poet into the symbolical object, it arises out of the object when this object is contemplated by the poet, although it refers also to other objects for which the meaning is *demanded*. It is another characteristic of Hölderlin's symbolism, not always found in Symbolist poetry, that the meaning felt by him in the symbolic object is a value demanded of another object (of man in particular), although this other object is not always explicitly mentioned. The intimate fusion of the hymnic and the elegiac in Hölderlin is often most clearly seen in this characteristic use by him of a symbol.

This extension of the meaning of the symbol outwards, as well as the nature of the symbolic object used by him (river, mountain, night, etc.) distinguish Hölderlin's symbolism from that of many other poets, notably the Symbolists of the later nineteenth century. If we accept W. B. Yeats's distinction (*The Symbolism of Poetry*, in vol. VI of the *Collected Works*) between symbols that evoke emotion alone, and intellectual symbols that evoke ideas alone, or ideas mingled with emotions, then Hölderlin's symbols can be called intellectual. We can apply to the poetry of the Symbolists of the later nineteenth century Mr T. S. Eliot's remarks on poetic imagery:

Only a part of an author's imagery comes from his reading. It comes from the whole of his sensitive life since early childhood. Why, for all of us, out of all that we have heard, seen, felt, in a lifetime, do certain images recur, charged with emotion, rather than others? The song of one bird, the leap of one fish, at a particular place and time, the scent of one flower, an old woman on a German mountain path, six ruffians seen through an open window playing cards at night at a small French railway junction where there was a water-mill: such memories may have symbolic value, but of what we cannot tell, for they come to represent the depths of feeling into which we cannot peer. We might just as well ask why, when we try to recall visually some period in the past, we find in our memory just the few meagre arbitrarily chosen set of snapshots that we do find there, the faded poor souvenirs of passionate moments. (*The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*, 1933.)

Louis MacNeice, commenting on this passage (*The Poetry of W. B. Yeats*, p. 137), remarks that the use of such private symbols makes for obscurity:

Such symbolism is a common cause of obscurity in modern poetry; it is only necessary to mention Rilke. With the growing recognition of the Unconscious poets have ceased to censor images which seem to them significant but whose significance they cannot define.

Such a private, esoteric meaning does not attach to Hölderlin's symbols and images, until late in his life, when his rational faculties became obscured. The unconscious did not yet for him possess the value which it later acquired. He is a descendant of the age of Enlightenment of the era of Kant. If he is also a descendant of the age of Storm and Stress and shared with the poets of that period, notably with Heinse, whom he greatly admired, a veneration of Rousseau's cult of emotion, he has passed on from their one-sided attitude to a renewed acceptance of reason, which he calls 'sacred', not unlike his other admired model Schiller. It was one of the early errors of Hölderlin criticism to identify him too closely with the Romantic tendency in German literature, an error fostered by the fact that some of the Romantics, especially Arnim and Brentano, were among the first to recognize the greatness of his later poetry.

Hölderlin's valuation of consciousness and reason, their necessity for the production of great poetry, is made clear in his theoretical writings:

Da wo die Nüchternheit dich verlässt, da ist die Grenze deiner Begeisterung. Der grosse Dichter ist niemals von sich selbst verlassen, er mag sich so weit über sich selbst erheben als er will. Man kann auch in die Höhe fallen, so wie in die Tiefe. (Vol. III, p. 242)

His desire to maintain the integrity of artistic consciousness is one of the most noteworthy characteristics of the nature and style of his poetry, and credit is due to M. Bertaux for having recognized and duly emphasized this: 'Pour qu'une poésie soit authentique il faut, dit Hölderlin, que la connaissance, c'est-à-dire que le langage reproduise le mouvement de la pensée. Or la pensée, la vie spirituelle a un rythme type.'¹ If we keep this principle in mind and notice how Hölderlin applies it to a definition of lyric poetry, we shall see what he means by a symbol and understand the nature of his symbolism.

It is first of all necessary to remember that by the reproduction of the movement of thought Hölderlin does not mean the reproduction of its logical sequence. He seems to be one of the first to express clearly the view that thinking in poetry proceeds in a manner entirely different from thinking in philosophy. He defends the use of inversions not as Herder and Klopstock² had done, in the interest of poetic style alone, but because they are of the essence of poetic thought.

Man hat Inversionen der Worte in der Periode. Grösser und wirksamer muss aber dann auch die Inversion der Perioden selbst sein. Die logische Stellung der Perioden, wo dem Grunde (der Grundperiode) das Werden, dem Werden das Ziel, dem Ziele der Zweck folgt, und die Nebensätze immer nur hinten angehängt sind an die Hauptsätze, worauf sie sich zunächst beziehen—ist dem Dichter gewiss nur höchst selten brauchbar. (Vol. III, p. 241.)

The cultivation of such inversions embracing whole periods becomes more and more prominent in Hölderlin's poetry, the more certain he grows in the mastery of his art. It is a feature of his mature style, reflecting the alogical progress of his thought within the compass of each work. If realism can be termed the reproduction of emotions and thoughts in the state in which they are apprehended or felt, Hölderlin's mature style is supremely realistic. The moment of feeling and apprehension has with him become an integral part of lyric utterance. Hence we shall often find him beginning his later poems with a description of the time and place in which his thoughts and feelings occur to him—cf. the remarkably vivid evocations in such poems as *Heimkunft, Stuttgart, Brot und Wein, Der Rhein*—and always referring to himself and to the creative process in which he is at that moment engaged. It is not the empirical ego which is indicated by him in thus mentioning himself, but the poetic self, the mind creatively occupied. He can therefore, as Rilke does later, use pronouns in the second as well as the first person, in order to refer to himself.

The progress of thought is seen by Hölderlin to be of a distinctive kind in lyric poetry. His theoretical work shows his interest in the differentiation of the poetic genres along lines that distinguish them from those pursued by the theorists of the earlier eighteenth century. While these critics, in more or less close agreement with Aristotle, defined the literary genres according to the purpose for which they are written and according to the effects which they produce in the minds of the reader or listener, Hölderlin differentiates them according to the creative processes from which they result. While the earlier theorists, whether they were themselves poets or not, adopt for the purpose of their distinctions the point of view of those for

Loc. cit. esp. pp. 233-4, 298, 318, 386, 389.

² Cf. Herder's *Fragmente*, ed. Suphan, vol. II, pp. 43-4, and Klopstock's essay *Von der Wortfolge*. In *Ossian und die Nieder alter Völker*

Herder also demanded the use of allogical sequences in poetry. But he does not, at the same time, seem to have kept the unity of the poem in mind to the extent which Hölderlin does.

whom poetry is written, Hölderlin makes distinctions which are in the first place significant for an active participant in the creative process. In this he follows, but advances upon, Herder, who, though not a poet, sympathetically understood the working of creative imagination, but who also pays considerable attention to the effect which poets produce in the mind of the reader. Herder's frequent use of the term *Wirkung* indicates his interest in this aspect of the poet's art, although he no longer thinks in the first instance of the use and purpose to which poetry is to be put.¹

For a definition of Hölderlin's conception of the symbol as he applies it in his poetry, the distinctions which he makes between tragic and lyric poetry will be found most useful. In this connexion it is necessary to know that the element of conflict or contrast for him belongs not only to dramatic poetry, but also to lyric poetry. This shows the extent of the difference between his ideas and current views on the subject of lyric poetry. He formulates a rule to indicate how freedom and practical activity, integrity of character and adaptation to the needs of life, can be reconciled, and this rule can be applied to his view of the making of poetry:

Setze dich mit freier Wahl in harmonische Entgegensetzung mit einer äusseren Sphäre. so wie du in dir selber in *harmonischer* Entgegensetzung bist, von Natur, aber unerkennbarer Weise, so lange du in dir selbst bleibst. (Vol. III, p. 296.)

The contrast which Hölderlin discovers in lyric poetry is one that lies behind poetry itself, the contrast between the inward feeling (*Innigkeit, Empfindung*) of the poet, from which the poem derives, and the succession of ideas and feelings as the poet expresses them in the poem. Hölderlin is clearly aware of this contrast, and it constitutes for him the peculiar appeal of lyric poetry, an appeal which, we might say, is a two-dimensional one, since it derives from the content of the poem itself as well as from the reference back to its emotional and spiritual source within the poet.

It is from this angle, too, that Hölderlin views the nature of poetic language, notably the language of lyric poetry. For him every poet creates his own language, if he is a true poet, i.e. if he can find the adequate word-material to express his inward feeling. He should not use a poetic language that is ready made for him. Language should come to him, he should discover it intuitively (*ahnden* is the term used by Hölderlin) when he has become aware of his feelings, and not before. Poetic language, then, is a product of the dialectic process which characterises the writing of poetry:

In eben diesem Augenblicke, wo sich die ursprüngliche lebendige, nun zur reinen, eines Unendlichen empfanglichen Stimmung geläuterte Empfindung, als Unendliches im Unendlichen, als geistiges Ganze im lebendigen Ganzen befindet, in diesem Augenblicke ist es, wo man sagen kann, dass die Sprache geahndet wird... (Vol. III, p. 304.)

Das Produkt dieser schöpferischen Reflexion ist die Sprache. Indem sich nämlich der Dichter mit dem reinen Ton seiner ursprünglichen Empfindung in seinem ganzen innern und äussern Leben begriffen fühlt und sich umsieht in seiner Welt, ist ihm diese eben so neu und unbekannt, die Summe aller seiner Erfahrungen, seines Wissens, seines Anschauens, seines Gedenkens... und es ist vorzüglich wichtig, dass er in diesem Augenblicke nichts als gegeben annehme, von nichts Positivem ausgehe, dass die Natur und Kunst, so wie er sie früher gelernt hat und sieht, nicht eher *spreche*, ehe für ihn eine Sprache da ist... (Vol. III, p. 307.)

Bearing in mind these considerations on the poet's method of composition and his language, we can approach Hölderlin's definition of the difference between dramatic

¹ Cf. for the above: V. Erdmann, *Hölderlins ästhetische Theorie* (Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen), 1923, esp. p. 44 *pass.*

and lyric poetry, and his conception of the use of symbols in lyric poetry. I quote three passages from the theoretical writings of Holderlin, in which these points are most clearly expressed. These statements do not exhaust his definitions, but they will serve to clarify the main argument.

1. Discussing the dramatic content and form of a tragedy, Hölderlin says: 'Es enthält einen dritten, von des Dichters eigenem Gemut und eigener Welt verschiedenen fremden Stoff, den er wählte, weil er ihn analog genug fand, um seine Totalempfindung in ihn hineinzutragen, und in ihm, wie in einem Gefasse, zu bewahren, und zwar um so sicherer, je fremder bei der Analogie dieser Stoff ist, denn die innigste Empfindung ist der Verganglichkeit in eben (dem) Grade ausgesetzt, in welchem sie die wahren wirklichen und sinnlichen Beziehungen nicht verleugnet (und es ist deswegen auch lyrisches Gesetz... den physischen und intellektualen Zusammenhang zu verleugnen). Eben darum verleugnet der tragische Dichter, weil er die tiefste Innigkeit ausdrückt, seine Person, seine Subjektivität ganz, er trägt sie in fremde Personalität, in fremde Objektivität über....' (Vol. III, p. 319p.)

2. Der poetische Geist kann also in der Verfahrungsweise, die er bei seinem Gesichte beobachtet, sich nicht begnügen in einem harmoniscentgegengesetzten Leben, auch nicht bei dem Auffassen und Festhalten desselben durch hyperbolische Entgegensetzung; ... es ist seine letzte Aufgabe, beim harmonischen Wechsel einen Faden, eine Erinnerung zu haben, damit der Geist nie im einzelnen Momente, und wieder einem einzelnen Momente, sondern in einem Momente wie im andern fortdauernd, und in den verschiedenen Stimmungen sich gegenwärtig bleibe.... (Vol. III, p. 290p.)

3. Das Gesetz, der Kalkül, die Art, wie, ein Empfindungssystem, der ganze Mensch, als unter dem Einflusse des Elements sich entwickelt, und Vorstellung und Empfindung und Rasonnement, in verschiedenen Sukzessionen, aber immer nach einer sichern Regel nacheinander hervorgehen, ist im Tragischen mehr Gleichgewicht als reine Aufeinanderfolge. (Vol. v, p. 175p.)

In the first of these passages Holderlin in his own way distinguishes between dramatic poetry and lyric poetry as 'objective' and 'subjective' respectively, adding that tragedy modifies reality (*die wahren wirklichen und sinnlichen Beziehungen*), while the tragic poet also effaces his own personality. The lyric poet, on the other hand, effaces (*verleugnet*) not his own personality, but external reality in its physical and intellectual aspects. Both poets, however, preserve the integrity of their inward feelings. The difference is one of degree. The main task of poetry is the exposition of personal feeling in an attitude to life. In the case of tragic poetry this is done in an impersonal manner, i.e. by means of choosing an alien material (*fremden Stoff*) which serves analogically to show forth the poet's feelings. In the case of the lyric poet the utterance remains purely personal, since he cannot choose this method of analogical exposition. He voices his feelings directly, whereas the tragic poet selects the indirect way, through an alien material.

How then can the lyric poet produce a unified work, that is to say a work that is knit together as the tragic poem is knit together by means of analogical material? In other portions of his theoretical work (cf. esp. vol. III, p. 276 f.), Hölderlin stresses the importance of the tones and moods of which a poem consists. The progress of these tones and moods is one of his chief interests, and he distinguishes the genres according to the progress which they favour. The second passage quoted above then shows that Hölderlin also demands the preservation of unity within the progress of moods. He uses the word *fortdauernd*. He demands that the first stage in the succession of ideas and feelings should not be eliminated by the second stage, nor the second by the third, etc., but that the first should co-exist with the second, the first and second with the third, etc. Hölderlin's conception of time as *Dauer*, comparable with Bergson's *durée*, underlies this demand of unity within progress.

The third passage quoted above defines the difference between the progress of ideas and feelings in dramatic and lyric poetry as that of balance and pure succession respectively. Balance can be achieved in tragic poetry because of the element of conflict so essential to its nature. But we also remember that Hölderlin sees in lyric poetry a contrast, formed between the original feelings of the poet and the succession of ideas and moods displayed by him in the poem. It is with reference to this contrast that his use of the symbol in lyric poetry is indicated, which is at the same time his answer to the question how a lyric poem can be made into a unified whole.

In the second passage quoted above Holderlin states that it is not the sole purpose of the poet to arrest (*festhalten*) the contrast of which he had spoken. Even the reproduction of thought in its poetic form does not suffice for him as the ultimate criterion of the procedure (*Verfahrungsweise*) of the poet. What characterizes it in the last resort is the invention of a link (*Faden*) that assists the memory in its passage from mood to mood, thus helping to preserve that unity which Hölderlin desires. It appears to me that what Holderlin must mean by this thread connecting poetic moods is in fact a symbolical reference. It is only symbolical thinking in poetry that adequately represents all the aspects of the definitions given by Holderlin. The meaning issuing from the symbol connects together the moods (hymnic, elegiac, etc.) comprised in the kind of poetry that Hölderlin writes. The symbol thus takes the place of the *fremder Stoff* by which the tragic poet conveys his personal feeling. Symbolical utterance is in a sense analogical exposition as is that of the dramatist. But it remains a direct and personal statement, whereas, we have seen, Hölderlin recognizes the impersonal nature of the tragic poet's utterance.¹

Finally we may cite a statement by Holderlin in his notes on Sophocles' *Antigone*, which aptly sums up his views on the use of symbols:

Est ist ein grosser Behelf der geheimarbeitenden Seele, dass sie auf dem höchsten Bewusstsein dem Bewusstsein ausweicht.... In hohem Bewusstsein vergleicht sie sich dann immer mit Gegenständen, die kein Bewusstsein haben, aber in ihrem Schicksal des Bewusstseins Form annehmen (Vol. v, p. 255).

III

If the above explanation of Holderlin's theoretical views is found to be an acceptable one, it must become clear that his conception and use of the symbol in poetry differ considerably from those of the Symbolist poets of the later nineteenth century.² His symbolism is not, as is theirs, impressionistic in origin, if by impressionism is meant that fastidious attention to sensations deriving from nature and the world of things, and that careful storing up in the mind of the images evoked by these sensations. The process in which Symbolism originated on the basis of such impressionism is elucidated by the following statements of two authors belonging to that period:

I then saw, vaguely drifting into form, plastic images of antiquity, which outlined themselves, became definite, and seemed to represent symbols of which I only seized the idea with difficulty. (A. Symons: *The Symbolist movement in literature*, p. 32, quoting a statement by Gérard de Nerval.)

¹ For a good example of symbolic thinking in the interpretation of poetry cf. Holderlin's explanation of Pindar's poem which he calls 'Das Belebende' (vol. v, p. 272p.). It is interesting to note how his derivation of the word 'centaur' makes him explain what Pindar says of the

centaurs in terms of his own favourite symbol of the river. That Holderlin's explanation is entirely unwarranted, is of no importance in this connexion.

² Cf. now in particular C. M. Bowra, *The Heritage of Symbolism*, 1943.

I spent a good deal of (the night) in the woods, where the streaming moonlight lit up things in magical checkered play, and it seemed as if the Gods of all the nature-mythologies were holding an indescribable meeting in my breast with the moral Gods of the inner life. . . The intense significance of some sort, of the whole scene, if one could only tell the significance. . . In point of fact, I can't find a single word for all that significance, and don't know what it was significant of, so there it remains, a mere boulder of *impression*. (William James, quoted in R. E. M. Harding: *An Anatomy of Inspiration*, 1942, p. 93.)

The procedure here described differs in obvious ways from that of Wordsworth recollecting emotion in tranquillity, remembering the daffodils without attaching a symbolic value to them. It also, however, differs from that represented in Hölderlin's remarks on the poet's *Verfahrungsweise*. It is the difference between the process in the mind of one who does not himself know what symbolic value attaches to the impression which he has received or to the image which it has evoked in him, and the process in the mind of another, whose main task is the adequate expression of known values.

This difference may explain the fact that whereas in Symbolist poetry dreams play an important part, they hardly exist as a motif in Hölderlin's work, at any rate not in the sense which the interest in the unconscious allows. How little Hölderlin's symbols issue from the region below the threshold of consciousness is thereby made manifest. It is only, as we shall see, when he begins to lose control of his conscious faculties, when his mind is clouded by madness, that symbols of another order, of the order of Symbolist poetry, are to be found in his work.

But if Hölderlin's poetry is the product of a conscious attitude, it does not, except perhaps in the earliest stages, bear the mark of calculated self-consciousness. It is singularly free from the excesses that mar the work of some of the greatest Symbolists. The purity of Hölderlin's art, a quality so frequently remarked upon in even the most critical accounts of his poetry, is an expression of his intense seriousness. There are no light touches in his poetry,¹ and there is none of that irony which Thibaudet discovers in Mallarmé.² He does not seem to have found it necessary to express his dissatisfaction with the work of contemporary poets, so that he was not compelled to develop his style in outspoken opposition to theirs. In this respect, too, he has little in common with the writers of the later nineteenth century.

We have no direct information as to the manner in which Hölderlin set to work in writing his poetry. He has left no account of it, nor has any one of his friends. But the manuscripts of his poems give us some indication of the care which he took in choosing his phrases, often tentatively adopting several before he found the right ones. The fact, too, that some of his most significant poems are given in two or more different versions, is enlightening. It means that his thought had progressed in the interval of writing the earlier version and that he had to alter or even recast the poem in order to make it conform with his newer idea. Finally, there are sometimes gaps in his poems, which he certainly intended to fill. This would indicate that the rhythmic scheme of his poetry was usually complete before the idea had taken final shape in words, and indeed he frequently marked in the feet he wished to place in the gap before having the word material ready.

We can scarcely go wrong in surmising that Hölderlin's inspiration was largely rhythmical in origin, and it is clear that this is no contradiction of the reflective nature of his poetry. A strong rhythmic bent is more frequently found in conjunc-

¹ Notice the only categories which he recognizes in lyric poetry. 'Naives Gedicht', 'Energisches Gedicht', 'Idealisches Gedicht' (III, p. 274).

² *La Poésie de S. Mallarmé*, 1926, p. 80 *pass.*

tion with a desire to express ideas in poetry, than with an interest in recording purely visual sensations. Certainly this is true of Hölderlin. A remarkable feature of his poetry is the relative absence of an interest in the effects of colour in nature, the more so since one of his admired models, Matthisson, paid so much attention to them. Colour does not seem to have played the part as a source of his symbolism which it did with the poets of the nineteenth century. This feature, as well as much else that has been indicated above, also distinguished Hölderlin's poetry from that of his contemporaries, the elder Romantics, whose work, particularly that of Novalis, is so important as a source of the poetry of the French Symbolists.

The characteristic quality of Hölderlin's use of the symbol, then, consists in the fact that the symbol possesses for him two points of reference: one to the human world at large, for which the value revealed by the symbol is demanded by the poet, and another to the inner world of the poet himself, not however to his private world of dreams and sensations, inexplicable even to himself, but to the known source of feeling and aspiration which is the source of the poem itself.

When Hölderlin was at the height of his poetic power, this was the function of the symbol for him. Only when his disease began to master him, only in the last stage of his poetic career, does the more personal symbol obtrude itself. The poetry which he then wrote is by no means as devoid of beauty and meaning as some critics believe: it has the meaning and beauty that Symbolist poetry has revealed to us. But it is a remarkable spectacle to observe the dark powers of the unconscious overpowering him in his conscious pursuit of mastery in his art. His is not the willing self-sacrifice of his own hero Empedocles. He recoiled from the abyss and prayed for sanity and time to say what he felt and knew was left for him to say. His destiny overtook him before his task was complete.

E. L. STAHL

SOME MODERN SWEDISH WRITERS

Interrupted and restricted communications have made it difficult to maintain contact with Swedish literature during the war years. The following brief notes on some writers who have died since September 1939 make no pretence at completeness or any critical estimate of the authors concerned, they are merely intended to bridge the gap until full access to their works is possible.

AGNES VON KRUSENSTJERNA-SPRENGEL, who died on 9 March 1940, was one of the most gifted of the younger Swedish woman novelists of this century.¹ She possessed a rare narrative talent and an intuitive capacity for psychological characterization. Among her earlier novels the Tony cycle (*Tony vaxer upp*, 1922; *Tonys laroår*, 1924; *Tonys sista laroår*, 1926) are best known, they form a trilogy describing a girl's development during the critical years of adolescence. Another cycle, *Vveka von Lagercronas historia*, began to appear in 1935, but the author did not live to complete it. There was a streak of insanity in Agnes von Krusenstjerna's family, and she gradually fell a victim to this affliction. This partly accounts for the fact that her writings are dominated by sexual problems and the social phenomena exhibited by a decaying aristocracy. In places her novels show signs of artistic exhaustion, but from 1935 on there is a distinct recovery. Her last published work was a collection of poems, *Nunnornas hus* (1937).

SELMA LAGERLOF died on 16 March 1940.² For the last ten years of her life she lived in complete retirement at her old home Mårbacka in Varmland, and the works published during that period are of minor importance. Next to Strindberg she is perhaps the one modern Swedish writer who has achieved an international reputation, and nearly all her novels have been translated into English.³ *Gösta Berlings saga* (1891) is a typical representative of the romanticism of the nineties; it recounts in highly subjective and lyrical prose a number of Varmland legends and local traditions centred in the ancient manor-house of Rottneros (the *Ekeby* of the novel). Whilst its author's reputation was firmly established by this work, it is probable that she will be equally remembered for the novel *Jerusalem* (1901-2). Here, as in *Gösta Berling*, the novelist has taken her subject-matter from actual fact—an American revivalist movement which had passed over the province of Dalecarlia in the mid-nineteenth century and finally led to an extensive emigration to the Holy Land. The novel is notable both as a powerful and highly poetic description of Swedish peasant life and for the skill with which the struggle between conscience and religious ecstasy is portrayed. As in the Old Icelandic family sagas, by which the style is influenced, there is a strong feeling of attachment to the farm which has been in the hands of the same family from time immemorial. The second part of the story depicts the fate of the emigrant peasants in Jerusalem, where they seek to lead the life of the early Christians, spurning worldly possessions.

In her later works *Mårbacka* (1922), *Lowenskoldska ringen* (1925), *Charlotte Lövensköld* (1925) and *Anna Svärd* (1928), Selma Lagerlöf describes scenes from her

¹ The latest book on this writer is: S. Ahlgren, *Krusenstjerna-studier*, Stockholm, Bonnier, 1940.

² A memoir appeared in *The Times* of 18 March 1940. The latest Swedish study of this writer is: L. Brodin, *Froken på Mårbacka. En*

bok om människan Selma Lagerlöf, Uppsala, Svensk hembygd, 1940.

³ A list of English translations of her works is given in W. A. Berendsohn, *Selma Lagerlöf*, London, Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1931.

childhood days in Varmland and Stockholm with the same masterly narrative art and the same wealth of imagination as in her earlier novels. Not least of the works on which her fame rests is the children's book, *Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige* (1906-7), in which she describes the various provinces of Sweden as seen by a little Scanian boy from the back of a wild goose flying over the country. Though in places it is weak and diffuse, it remains a charming combination of poetry and geography.¹

Another famous Swedish writer was VERNER VON HEIDENSTAM, who died on 20 May 1940. In his youth he travelled extensively, for the sake of his health and education, in southern Europe and the Middle East, where he acquired a great variety of impressions from the countries and peoples he saw and developed a keen artistic vision. On his return to Sweden he published his *Vallfart och vandringsår* (1888), an imaginative collection of lyrics depicting colourful scenes from the variegated life of the Orient. This work inaugurated the poetry of the nineties and marked a reaction from the gloomy features and lack of imagination that characterized the naturalism of the eighties. In course of time Heidenstam's love of Nature inspired in him an enthusiasm for the beauty of the Swedish countryside, and this in turn kindled an interest in Swedish history. Towards the end of the nineties he became predominantly an interpreter of great historical events and patriotic sentiments. To this period belongs the cycle of historical novels known as *Karolinerna* (*The heroes of Charles XII*). The author's thesis is that the finest qualities in the Swedish race are evoked in times of poverty and distress, and these vivid and varied pictures describe such a time. Heidenstam's subsequent works are mainly written in prose. In *Heliga Birgittas pilgrimsfärd* (*St Birgitta's Pilgrimage*, 1901) and *Folkungaträdet* (*The Folkunga Dynasty*, 1905) he plunged into medieval traditions and gave a poetic interpretation of the early history of Sweden. In 1915 he turned to verse once more and published a volume of *Nya dikter*, partly lyric and partly epic in content. Here the hedonism of his early works gives place to the melancholy resignation of approaching old age. Since then a number of essays and sketches have appeared, including two works published posthumously in 1941: *När kastanjerna blommade* and *Tänkar och utkast*.²

In its wealth of ideas, stylistic brilliance and great originality, Heidenstam's work is among the finest products of Swedish literature. Like Selma Lagerlöf he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature and was elected a member of the Swedish Academy.

ALBERT ENGSTRÖM, who died on 16 November 1940, was both an artist and a man of letters. He was born in 1869 at Lönneberga in the province of Småland and as a young man studied art in Gothenburg under the celebrated painter Carl Larsson. Then he began contributing drawings to the periodical *Söndags-Nisse*, and in 1897 founded the humorous paper *Strix*, which has become an established favourite in Sweden. To this journal he contributed a large number of drawings and articles and showed himself to be a master of the art of depicting Swedish national types. From 1905 on his literary work began to appear in book form.

¹ A recent study of this work is G. Ahlström, *Den underbara resan*, Stockholm, 1942.

² Principal translations: *Sweden's Laureate*, Selected poems translated by C. W. Stork, Yale Univ. Press, London, Humphrey Milford, 1919. *The Tree of the Folkungs*, Gyldendal, London and Copenhagen, 1925. *The Charles' Men*, translated

by C. W. Stork, New York, Scandinavian Classics, xv, 1920; Cape, London, 1933. *A King and his Campaigners*, translated by A. Tegnier, London, 1902. *The Swedes and their Chieftains*, translated by C. W. Stork, London and New York, Scandinavian Classics, xxv, 1925.

Albert Engström excels in describing country life in Sweden. In *Smålands-berättelser* he depicts scenes and characters from his boyhood, some of them illustrated by his own drawings: the peasant who undertakes the adventure of a train journey to the nearest town for the first time, the old cronies in the cottage which serves as a rural home for the aged, and many other amusing types. Another group of sketches deals with life in the skerries of Roslagen, north of Stockholm; these date from the time when Engström moved to the fishing village of Grisslehamn. Here he gained the same intimate contact with skippers and fishermen as he had previously had with farmers and crofters. The stories of the skerries clearly show the influence of Strindberg's *Hemsöborna* and *Skärkärsliv*; but in force and directness Engström surpasses his master. Moreover he shows a warm, sympathetic attitude to his characters, there is none of Strindberg's distrust of his fellow men. Wherever he finds his models Albert Engström sees them with the artist's eye for characteristic features—especially those which are characteristically Swedish—and with the humorist's sense of genuinely human qualities. And in the midst of his humorous sketches there are passages of really fine landscape description. Two books on foreign travel are *Åt Håckleffjäll* (1913), an account of a journey to Iceland, and *Moskoviter* (1924), a description of a visit to Russia.

Engström excels in characterizing primitive types, whose temperaments, thoughts and modes of expression he renders with a direct and often startling veracity. It is surprising that his works have not been translated into English, for his is a type of humour which should be appreciated in this country.

TORSTEN FOGELQVIST, who died on 24 January 1941, was a teacher who turned to journalism and literary composition. After having spent his earlier years on the staff of Brunnsviks Folkhögskola in Dalecarlia, a continuation school for industrial workers, he became editor of the Stockholm radical newspaper *Aftonbladet* in 1918 and subsequently went over to *Dagens Nyheter*, the chief liberal organ in Sweden. From 1925 on he was responsible for political matters and became the chief protagonist of cultural liberalism.

Torsten Fogelqvist's literary production includes two volumes of verse: *På vaxtavla* (1912) and *Sånger till den förlovrade skönheten* (1915), besides several collections of literary essays. In 1931 he published a study of Erik Axel Karlfeldt, one of the most eminent Swedish lyricists of recent times, and in the same year was elected a member of the Swedish Academy. Two years later he published a study of Albert Engström. As a lyric poet Fogelqvist somewhat resembles Karlfeldt; there is the same manly, austere note and the same sonority of verse. As an essayist and critic he is distinguished by a vigorous and original style, and his opinions are free from pedantry and conventionalism.

ERIK LINDORM, who died on 30 January 1941, was pre-eminently a lyric poet. He made his début in 1908 with a number of polemical brochures and a slender volume of poems, *Bubblor från botten*. From 1915 on he took to journalism, cultivating the literary causerie and dramatic criticism. As an offshoot from his specialization in causerie literature he wrote a number of social comedies.¹ But his most original contribution to Swedish literature is in the field of the lyric, more particularly the lyric of proletarian life in Stockholm. Having lost his parents and his home at an early age and suffered the effects of poverty, Erik Lindorm was able to express very vividly the joy of possessing a home of his own with wife and family. His first collection of poems, *Tal till mitt hjärta* (1912), revealed a surprising maturity

¹ *Molock* (1926), *Rötmånad* (1928), *Röda dagen* (1929).

in the young poet. Among the poems of proletarian life *En död arbetarhustru* is especially well known. Three other collections of verse followed,¹ slight in size but of sterling lyric quality. In these poems he has contributed a new element to the lyric of Stockholm life: he describes with vivid realism and warm sympathy the life of the artisan family, the heroism of lives spent in penury and drudgery in the working-class district of a great city.

KARIN BOYE, who died on 24 April 1941, was the most gifted of the younger generation of Swedish women writers and pre-eminently a lyricist. She was born in Gothenburg in 1900, studied at Uppsala and graduated there in 1928. During the twenties she published three collections of poems expressing religious sentiments, the proud spirit of sacrifice and austere idealism.² But in course of time she outlived this idealistic phase and abandoned the idyll of everyday life as being symptomatic of intellectual stagnation. The change is reflected in the poems published in 1935 under the title of *För tradets skull* and in a number of novels.³ Here Karin Boye glorifies the purely vital values, elementary warmth and love and ruminative wisdom. Incorruptible integrity, psychological penetration and a propensity to abstract thought are the principal features of her work. Her novels deal mainly with psychological problems. Some further poems and a collection of essays have appeared posthumously.⁴

KARL-ERIK FORSSLUND, who died on 14 August 1941, was a writer who belonged to a group which became prominent during the nineties in connection with the newly awakened interest in the provinces. Thus he is a representative of *hembygds-litteratur* or *Heimatkunst*, and the province he describes is Dalecarlia. Like Fogelqvist he was for a time headmaster of the Folkhögskola at Brunnsvik.

In 1896 Forsslund published *Skog*, a collection of sketches from the ancient mining district of Bergslagen with its forests and lakes, and he remained faithful to this part of Sweden in his later writings (Bergslagen is a comprehensive name for the ore-bearing portions of Västmanland, Värmland and Dalecarlia). In a prolific flow of verse, and in stories of wild life in the uncultivated regions he continued to sing the praises of his native province and the joys of country life. Forsslund's best-known prose work is *Storgården* (1900), in which he describes the ancient house near Ludvika which he afterwards made his home. Written partly in the form of letters and interspersed with poems, this novel contrasts the stale unprofitable life of 'den lärda småstaden' (Uppsala) and 'storstaden' (Stockholm) with the delights of a 'lantgård' through the shifting scenes of the year. The spirit of the book may be summed up in the English words which the author himself uses as a motto for the second part: 'There are none happy in the world but beings who enjoy freely a vast horizon.' Of particular interest are the chapters depicting country pursuits in Sweden during the various seasons of the year.

Forsslund's principal collections of verse are *Arbetare* (1902), *Lantliga låtar* (1906) and *Till fjälls* (1911), and they breathe the same spirit of enthusiastic nature worship. Much of his prose is strongly lyrical and often approaches a tone of fervour. During the last twenty years of his life his interest was mainly directed to the preservation of ancient forms of popular culture, the creation of wild life sanctuaries and national parks. His most monumental work is *Med Dalälven från källorna till*

¹ *Min värld* (1918), *Domedagar* (1920), *Bekännelser* (1922).

² *Moln* (1922), *Gömda land* (1924), *Härdarna* (1927).

³ *Merit vaknar* (1933), *Kris* (1934), *För lite* (1936).

⁴ *De sju döds synderna och andra efterlämnade dikter* (1941), *Minnen och studier* (1942).

havet (1919-36). it appeared in twenty-six parts and consists of a large-scale and very detailed description of the whole region drained by one of the principal rivers in Sweden, covering physical features, architecture, anthropology, folklore and national costume. Forsslund was a member of numerous learned societies and was awarded the honorary doctorate of the University of Uppsala in 1927.

HJALMAR SÖDERBERG, who died on 14 October 1941, was a novelist of the first rank. He belonged to the generation of writers who, following the neo-Romanticists of the nineties, exhibit a mood of disillusionment and pessimism in their works. His early attempts at short stories¹ revealed him as a master of prose; they were written with a witty elegance and conciseness of expression that gave proof of no mean intellectual and aesthetic ambition. Soderberg, like Albert Engstrom, follows in the footsteps of Strindberg as a writer of sober direct prose. With the novel *Martin Bircks ungdom* (1901) he became one of the leading writers of his age. It is a brilliant description of the Stockholm of the nineties, when it was beginning to lose its provinciality and emerge as a European capital, and at the same time typical of the pessimistic *fin de siècle* attitude. Many of the younger generation who had lost their faith in the social reformation of the eighties and the *joie de vivre* of the nineties, felt the same sense of ennui and disillusionment as Martin Birck. The novel depicts the intellectual unrest of the times and voices the author's revolt against the conventional standards of society. With its poetic melancholy, its calm and unfaltering love of clarity and truth, the book had considerable influence on the younger writers of the period.

The first decade of the new century was Hjalmar Soderberg's most productive period; but even so his productivity was slight compared with that of many of his contemporaries. Besides a number of short stories and a novel, *Dr Glas* (1905), dealing with the right to kill, he produced some plays,² but these showed that his strength lay in the novel rather than the drama. For, witty and pointed though his language as a playwright is, he nevertheless seems to lack the capacity for creating living characters and real dramatic force.

With the advent of the Great War Soderberg entirely lost contact with the times. Compared with the chaos and elemental forces let loose by the war his world seemed a paltry little affair. He settled for the rest of his life in Denmark, lived in strict seclusion and devoted himself to the study of the history of religion. The fruits of this study were *Jahves eld* (1918) and *Jesus Barabbas* (1928), both dealing in literary form with problems of the history of religion, but from a negative point of view. These were followed by a further collection of short stories, *Resan till Rom* (1929).

Hjalmar Soderberg is a specifically intellectual writer. As indicated above, the Swedish author who has influenced him most is Strindberg. *Martin Bircks ungdom* wrestles with problems of current thought and society in the same way as *Tjänstekvinnans son* and *Roda rummet* had done in the preceding period. Like Strindberg, Soderberg is ruthless in his criticism, acute and precise in his language, free from illusion, and a hater of humbug. Another Scandinavian writer who has meant almost as much to him as Strindberg is Herman Bang; Söderberg's narrative art recalls the impressionistic and apparently capricious manner of the Danish writer. His style received its final polish from France; from Maupassant he acquired clarity and precision and a complete mastery of the technique of the short story, whilst Anatole France (whom he translated into Swedish) stimulated his narrative irony

¹ *Förvillelser* (1895); *Historietter* (1898).

² *Främlingarna* (1903), *Gertrud* (1906).

and, above all, showed him the way to the literary form which was to become his own—that in which the story is a mere vehicle for the thought.

In a sense Hjalmar Söderberg's works sum up the emotional life of an entire generation. A characteristic feature of them all is the hatred of prejudice and hypocrisy, especially the Victorian—or to give it its Swedish name, the Oscarian type. His pictures of Stockholm life rank him with Bellman and Strindberg.

Apart from the authors mentioned above, several Swedish *filologer* have died in recent years. Dr Nils Svanberg (*ob.* 1939) was a lecturer in *nordiska språk* at the University of Uppsala who had specialized in the field of stylistics, mainly following on the theories of Benedetto Croce. His most recent works were studies in the style of Tegnér, Heidenstam and Fröding; and he had also published some original lyric verse.

Dr Johan Mortensen (*ob.* 1940) took up a journalistic career in London in 1921 after having held lectureships in the history of literature at the Universities of Lund and Uppsala from 1897. He and his wife were killed in an air-raid on London. His chief works were *Från Aftonbladet till Røda rummet* (1905) and *Från Røda rummet till sekelskiftet* (1918–19).

Dr Otto von Friesen (*ob.* 1942) was professor in *nordiska språk* at the University of Uppsala. He wrote many books and articles on Germanic philology and paleography and was a European authority on runology.

In conclusion, I have pleasure in making acknowledgments to the Ministry of Information, Northern Section, for their kindness in obtaining particulars of the most recent works published by the authors dealt with; also to Hr. V. Hammarling, Swedish Press Attaché in London, and Hr. Åke Lagerstedt, Gothenburg, for verifying points of detail.

R. J. McCLEAN

LONDON

SOVIET LINGUISTICS IN 1942

The scene witnessed at a recent meeting of the Philological Faculty of the Moscow University would have been rather unusual in peace time, but was highly expressive of the state of science in the Soviet Union in war time. The Faculty had met to hear a dissertation for candidate's degree (the equivalent of the English master's degree), and the applicant was a young man in military uniform who had received furlough to come to Moscow for the purpose.

No less significant was the subject of his dissertation: 'Verb Aspects in the Bashkir Language.' It is noteworthy that this was the first dissertation ever presented on the Bashkir language. As we know, the study of the languages of the numerous nationalities of the Soviet Union has made tremendous strides in the past twenty-five years, and the work has not been suspended even in war time. The recent university session was in its way symbolical of this steady and uninterrupted progress of Soviet language study.

Harisov, the young expert in the Bashkir language, was awarded his master's degree by a consensus of votes of the members of the Faculty. His official opponents, Professors Dmitriev and Nasilov, both eminent Turcologists, expressed a highly favourable opinion of Harisov's work, particularly stressing the point that this was the first monographic investigation of the verb categories of the still almost unstudied Bashkir language. A few days later, Harisov, now a Master of Philological Science, rejoined the army in action.

Notwithstanding the difficulties created by the war for scientific work, especially in a field which has such little connexion with war-time needs as linguistics, the past year has been one of intense and fruitful effort by language scholars in the U.S.S.R. In Moscow these activities were mainly centred in the University and in the Language and Literature Institute of the Academy of Sciences. The principal results of this work are as follows.

In the field of Russian language and its history, worthy of mention is the *Small Dictionary of the Russian Literary Language*, which will shortly be placed in the hands of the printer. It is a collective work of the Institute of Language and Literature, which was headed until his recent death by Ushakov and is now headed by the Academician Abnorsky. This dictionary is certain to become a fundamental reference work on Russian literary forms.

Studies have also been continued in the spheres of Russian grammar, dialects, and the ancient Russian language. The Institute of Language and Literature is at present engaged in compiling a dialectical atlas of the Moscow Region. The work has advanced considerably in the past year and promises to provide highly interesting material throwing light on what are known as the 'Middle Russian transitional dialects', from which the Russian literary language sprang. Another problem under investigation is the connexion between the modern literary language and the medieval, known as the Ecclesiastical Slavonic language. The Slavonic Section of the Institute has begun a systematic study of a long list of Russian literary relics of the eleventh to the twentieth centuries—from the *Russkaya Pravda* of Vladimir Monomakh to Alexander Blok—with the object of elucidating the history of the various categories of Ecclesiastical Slavonic in the Russian literary language and of tracing the various stages of their development. The work has so far been carried

down only to the seventeenth century, but already furnishes valuable material for a revision of views on these processes.

Mention should be made of a two-volumed monograph on the language of the *Ulozheniye* (Legal Code of 1649) of Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich, which was submitted as a dissertation for doctor's degree (the highest academic degree in the U.S.S.R.) by Professor Chernykh. This thorough and scholarly study raises a series of important problems in reference to the history of the Russian language in the period directly preceding the era of Peter the Great.

Another interesting and original work which will shortly be considered by the Philological Faculty of the Moscow University is a study by Gvozdyev, a Lecturer in the Faculty, on 'The Language of the Russian Child'. It traces the successive order in which the various language categories arise in the speech of the Russian child and is of no little interest from the standpoint both of the general psychology of speech and of Russian grammatical structure. Interesting, too, is a dissertation submitted by Sveshnikov on the history of the infinitive in the Balkan languages as is a study of Belorussian syntax by Lomtev.

Numerous studies were made of the language of the Caucasus. Since the outbreak of the war, Professor Yakovlev (of the Academy of Sciences), an eminent expert on the Caucasus, has contributed two important works, one on the Chechen syntax and the other on the grammatical structure of the Adygei language. Professor Zhirkov, who not long before the outbreak of the war published a grammar of the Avar language, has recently published an interesting Lezghin grammar, in which the chapter on declensions and tonic accents, presenting many new viewpoints, is of particular interest. Professor Zhirkov quite recently read an interesting paper at a meeting of the Academy of Sciences on the 'Origin of Multi-Case Declensions', based on rich material taken from the Caucasian, Finnish and African languages.

Neither have Soviet Turcologists, for whom the languages of the U.S.S.R. offer abundant material, been inactive in this past year. One of the most interesting works in 1942 in this sphere was Professor Dmitriev's study of new processes in the Azerbaijan language during the present war.

Everything goes to show that Soviet linguistic scholars will be no less active in the coming year. We know, for instance, that Professor Sergievsky will shortly be completing an extensive study of Rumanian and Slavonic language relations and Professor Peterson his work on the lexicon of Sanskrit, to mention only two.

GRIGORY VINOKUR

Moscow

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

WALTER SCOTT IN PANDEMONIUM

During the winter of 1801-2, Lord Minto had seven weeks free from parliamentary duties. In a rented Edinburgh house, he and his lady entertained friends who were attractive to them and to their maturing children. The philosophical Dugald Stewart, Professor Playfair, Francis Jeffrey, Harry Temple, the serious and almost perfect youth who was later to hold power as Lord Palmerston, Francis Horner, Lady Douglas of Bothwell, and Lord Webb Seymour, patient cultivator of his own mind, passed through their doors. Poets, whom the poetasting peer was delighted to advise, formed part of the company—Thomas Campbell and the original, agreeable, lame Walter Scott.

That summer, the Earl of Minto, who had meanwhile lodged Campbell in the 'Poet's room' of his Hanover Square, London, residence, brought the somewhat reluctant author from Edinburgh to Minto House in Roxburghshire, hoping that he would compose a substantial Bruce and Wallace poem within his own ancestral walls. They arrived on 27 August and found Walter Scott among the numerous guests. But republican Tom Campbell, lowly bred himself, did not feel comfortable with the 'fashionable, proud folks' whose slang was as unintelligible to him 'as the cant of the gypsies'. Only the host's sister-in-law, Lady Malmesbury, spoke 'a sentence of either good sense or amusing nonsense' in Campbell's hearing. He lost his way in the intricate passages leading to his room, and when at last safe from domesticities and the fashionable world in small, sat down to write the Rev. Archibald Alison (28 August 1802): 'The lords and ladies are laughing in the room below me, while I sit at a window that looks northward' [to Edinburgh]. It is hardly surprising that Campbell planned to stay only ten or twelve days.¹

What the contented, gay folk were laughing about is made clear by Lord Minto, who wrote Lady Palmerston on the same day:

In the evening the younger part of the society, including Elliot, form a circle, without candles, and tell hobgoblin stories till supper-time; the conversation is not confined to the narrator, but the whole ring is so vociferous that they have merited the title of Pandemonium. In the meanwhile, *she*, Lady Malm[esbury], and I, retreat upstairs to the library, and form a comfortable fogram party, pitying the noise and fatigues of youth, which we hear like the distant roar of the sea. We have had a most capital addition to the Hobgoblinites in Mr Walter Scott, editor of the 'Minstrelsy of the Border', who besides an inexhaustible fund of spectres, has a rich store of horrid murders, robberies, and other bloody exploits committed by and on our own forefathers, the Elliots. Mr Scott is a particularly pleasing and entertaining man.²

The only other Hobgoblinite besides Scott and Minto's twenty-year-old son Gilbert to be specifically mentioned is Elliot. If he may be identified as the Right Honourable William Elliot of Wells, Roxburghshire, his presence was indeed devilishly appropriate. While this gentleman was serving in Ireland as Privy Councillor and Secretary, his appearance, together with shy and silent ways, warranted the transfer of Monk Lewis's play title, *The Castle Spectre* (1797), to him. His return to Ireland as Chief Secretary set the wits searching again; this time (1806) they called him the 'Revenant'.

¹ *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, ed. William Beattie (London, 1850), I, 381, 383, 400, 453-4.

² *Life and Letters of Sir Gilbert Elliot First Earl of Minto*, ed. the Countess of Minto (London, 1874), III, 254-5.

Lord Minto seems to have described the disbanding of the not too 'Miltonic Pandemonium' in a letter to Thomas Campbell, who replied as late as 30 October: 'The breaking up of "Pandemonium" must have been a grand and affecting scene. Those members of it who happen to come northward I shall be happy to meet once more. With best compliments to all those (though infernal) spirits who yet remain in the seat of the old conclave, I am,' etc.¹

Scott himself was back at Lasswade Cottage on 6 September. Whether he took with him the manuscript of a *jeu d'esprit* written for the demonological circle is an unanswerable question. The Earl of Minto's greatniece was later to record a family tradition that 'a great part, if not the whole, of Walter Scott's *Demonology* and *Witchcraft* was written by him at Minto'.² Now, it is easily demonstrable that Scott wrote *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft* at Abbotsford and in Edinburgh from March to August 1830. The copy, forwarded in batches to the printer, was commented on in a letter of the publisher John Murray, 28 July: 'Ballantyne sent me 200 pages of the *Demonology* wch one of my daughters read & was very much interested with & my wife read it also but it frightened her—I sent them to [Sir Francis] Palgrave who knows as much of the subject as the author and he gave it great praise'.³ But that a short, early version may have been written during some visit to Minto between 1802 and 1805 is certainly suggested by the tradition and by the inclusion of 'Daemonology' among fourteen publication proposals by Scott (apparently drawn up in 1806).⁴ Years later, in a letter to Archibald Constable, Scott referred to the possibility of revising 'what I have had by me for some years—a dialogue on Popular Superstitions'.⁵

But to return to the *bon ton* devils. The most aloof of these, if devil he may be called, was Lord Minto. Yet we find him writing his wife, 5 March 1804, that he has had a jolly dinner at the Princess of Wales's house, Blackheath. 'We played at Pandemonium games, especially magical music, in a style inferior only to Dalkerith' [House, residence of the Earl of Dalkeith, afterwards Duke of Buccleuch].⁶ The feminine company must indeed have been sympathetic. The hostess, Princess Caroline, was as eager to retail as to collect ghost stories, of which Scott himself provided 'a great many' in 1809.⁷ Her social amusements in 1801, as Lady Charlotte Douglas pointed out, included French proverbs, forfeits, dancing sometimes, and 'musical magic'. When she learned to model in clay and to make plaster casts, her first attempt, said a foreign traveller, J. H. Compé, 'was the Leonora of Burger's celebrated [demon lover] ballad'.⁸ 'Monk' Lewis told Shelley and Byron in Geneva that the Princess of Wales 'was not only a believer in ghosts, but in magic and witchcraft, and... prophecies made in her youth had been accomplished since'.⁹

The principal guest at Blackheath, Lady Hester Stanhope, was later to use the supernatural in an attempt to fulfil Richard Brothers' prophecy that she would reign in Jerusalem as Queen of the East—and to come more and more under the influence of her own generous system of beliefs, which included transmigration of souls; Rosicrucian aerial spirits; charms, enchantments, and the evil eye; astrology,

¹ *Life of Campbell*, i, 406.

² *Life of Minto*, iii, 255, n. 1.

³ MS. Letters to J. G. Lockhart, ix, 96—National Library of Scotland.

⁴ Sir Herbert Grierson, *Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 83, n. 1.

⁵ 26 March 1823—Thomas Constable, *Archibald Constable and his Literary Correspondents* (Edinburgh, 1873), iii, 256-7.

⁶ *Life of Minto*, iii, 308.

⁷ Wilfred Partington, *Sir Walter's Post-Bag* (London, 1932), pp. 47-8.

⁸ J. H. Adolphus, *Memoirs of Caroline, Queen Consort of Great Britain* (London, 1831?), i, 65, 83.

⁹ *The Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. H. B. Forman (London, 1880), vi, 207-9, 18 August 1816. For a story of the ghost of Caroline's father, see *Letters from and to Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe*, ed. Alexander Allardyce (Edinburgh and London, 1888), i, 34.

her own star being the sun; and tenets adapted from Cornelius Agrippa. As her physician, Charles Meryon, succinctly commented, 'Her all-powerful mind had taken a strong bias towards daemonology, necromancy, and magic.'¹

Although Pandemonium was temporarily re-edified at Dalkeith or at Montague House, Blackheath, the parent conclave still acknowledged the Elliots of Minto and their kin as presiding spirits. How many times 'the wingèd Haralds' proclaimed

A solemn council forthwith to be held
At Pandemonium, the high capital
Of Satan and his peers...

I do not know. The implication of a thirty-one line invitation (dated 26 November 1805) from the facetious Secretary and Poet of Ello-Pandaemonium, Pandemonium Hall, to Scott, who was to appear at Christmas, is that the high-ranking demons met at least once a year. On this jovial occasion, the host was to be the Earl of Minto's uncle, Admiral John Elliot, who had retired from service because of infirm health after having been promoted in the colour hierarchy of the fleet from the Blue to the Red to the White.² It seems rather strange that the naval hero, who was of a somewhat uncompromising Presbyterian bent, should countenance a household parody of the nether world, but his distinguishing hospitality and love of society, together with an ability to concentrate on whist, probably made tolerance of youthful pranks easy. Consequently at Monteviot (or Mount Teviot), Roxburghshire, Pandemonium was to be reconstituted, and Scott was needed at the club meeting in order to instruct the members 'in mystical lore', 'to teach them to conjure', and 'to make their Teeth chatter at Goblin or Ghost'—

To tell them of Men by whom Ghosts have been seen
Or to make them lament over fair Pearling Jean.
In short, I cant tell the fine things you can do,
But all hands declare there is nothing like you;
And each Member amongst us this Motto has got }
That for Tales of Hobgoblins of Ghosts & what not }
No Mòrtal in Britain is like Walter Scott....

The letter is stamped Jedburgh and the red seal is impressed with a fly, the whole being endorsed by Scott 'The Correspondence of Demonica & Gilpin Horner'. I should suppose the seal to represent Satan's right-hand man, *Beelzebub*, whose name is from the Hebrew for 'fly-lord'. Scott's failure to answer brought another poetic epistle (dated 5 December), this time of sixty-one lines. Poor Demonica has been roundly abused by her companion devils; she must have a reply within eight days:

Oh write a few lines to prevent my Disgrace,
To save me from shame—and from losing my place.
Oh fill them with wit, so deficient in mine!...

These diabolical communications, together with the belated reply, are in the first volume of the *Scott Letter-Books*, which I have been permitted to use through the courtesy of the late Sir Hugh Walpole. The following poem, in another hand than Scott's, is a rather careless copy of autograph verses which were apparently mailed to Jedburgh. Although the lines are hardly what one might expect from the author

¹ *Memoirs of the Lady Hester Stanhope* (London, 1845), I, 145. See the Duchess of Cleveland, *The Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope* (London, 1914), pp. 174, 206, n. 1, 209-14, 372-6; and note

the titles of Paule Henry-Bordeaux' two volumes on *Lady Stanhope en Orient—La Circé du Désert* and *La Sorcière de Djoun*.

² *The Naval Chronicle*, IX (1803), 425-39.

of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*, itself 'a wild rude legend of Border *diablerie*'¹ the loose swing undoubtedly results from very rapid composition which was not even subjected to a cursory revision. I have altered or omitted some of the confusingly multiplied periods at the end of lines. The Maid addressed may have been Lord Minto's daughter, Anna Maria, who was then twenty years old.

Gilpin Horner to Demonica—Christmas 1805

Infernal Maid, I greet ye well.
Your favours came to hand from hell,
So witty and so courteous too,
That, give the Queen of Devils her due,
I should have sworn each sable line
Flow'd from the quill of Proserpine,
But that the fair sign manual shew'd
A blooming Princess of her blood,
Whom in the Forest I had seen
Reigning, herself, a Fairy Queen.

Demonica, canst thou doubt thy friend,
A poet, gentleman, & fiend?
And think a Devil, like worthless man,
Or dull Fogramma's owlish clan,
Could court ignoble, base repose,
And in some sulky corner doze,
When summon'd to the roaring click,
Where all the prattling babes of Nick,
Sweet innocents, keep up the ball
Round that good Devil, the Admiral?

I'll take my passage on a blast,
Till Eildon's triple top is past;
Then glancing down, a shooting star,
Without a drag, shall be my car;
Or lumps of ice shall be my sledge,
To rattle down cold Lyliard's edge;
Or some mare's tail shall be my hack,
Or I may ride the driving wrack;
Or loll at ease on downy snow,
Or in the moon beam's night coach go,
Or drive the comet's flying mail,
Or blow the horn upon its tail.
One way or other, if you watch,
You'll see me posting like old scratch.

What hinders, on my way from Town,
To take a chack at Ercildown,
And from my rhyming cronie there,
Stuff out my cloak bag with old ware.
Perhaps from Leider to the Tweed,
Astride one besom we may speed,
At Melrose cloister till it halts,
And sets us down in charnel vaults,
Where Monks' unrotted bodies dwell
And unlaid spirits haunt the cell,
Oft seen to flit on leathern wing,
And squeaking requiems heard to sing.

Thomas shall shew great Robert's heart,
That made three English Edwards smart,
On good Sir James's bosom fought,
And after death the battle sought.

¹ J. G. Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (Edinburgh and London, 1837-8), II, 22.

Then as the bloody crosses [cross's] glow
 Stains the cold shadowy tomb below,
 We'll heave dread Michael's massy stone,
 And shudder at the frowning bone.
 Last the fair Maid of Eildon tree
 Thomas shall shew me courteously.

Fear not. I'll bring sweet horrors soon,
 Shall make delighted list'ners swoon.

But funnier Tales of blood I'll tell, }
 How Muscovites are playing hell }
 With bayonets as long's an ell. }
 Young Sandy makes a bonny Deil.
 I wish he'd dance a threesome reel
 With you & me—'twould make me loup,
 For want of legs, upon my doup.

Of ghosts & kelpies I've a store.
 And some shall squeak & some shall roar,
 At Teviot's mount, by pale blue light,
 When Devilish tales e'en Devils fright.
 Or I can teach you knavish tricks,
 Of truant imps, that wade thro' Styx.
 If they can catch a Fogram doze,
 They'll drop a cinder on his toes,
 And make him dance as if Neil Gow
 Were rattling at him with his bow.
 But, wearied, if a second nap
 Refresh the Carl, some grinning chap
 In water cold his finger sticks,
 Till smoking streams run down his breeks.

I'll sing ye many a merry ploy,
 Shall make Deils wag their tails with joy.

Advise, Demoniac—take this hint—
 Ne'er think your Gilpin tint, tint, tint—¹

The poem was probably intended to be read to the assembled devils at Christmas and was therefore sent by an earlier mail. Meanwhile, at the Castle Street house in Edinburgh, Mrs Scott was providing her husband with a perfect excuse for refusing social invitations. Just one day before Christmas, she gave birth to a son, Charles.

The holiday meeting of 'Pandemonium' may have been the last. Lord Minto's eldest son, Gilbert, married the following year. Admiral Elliot died in 1808. The Earl of Minto himself accepted an official post in February 1806 and left England for India just a year later. The affable peer would have been shocked had he foreseen that he would return to Minto as a supernatural anomaly—a half-living, half-dead ghost, but so it was fated to be. On his way home from India in 1814, he died of strangury at Stevenage, Hertfordshire, on 21 June, and was buried in Westminster Abbey on the twenty-ninth. A man-drawn carriage had been prepared at Hawick for his reception; bonfires had been laid on the hills and triumphal arches erected at appropriate places. Not only that, but Minto House had been enlarged to twice its original size.² Scott recorded in his *Journal* for 23 December 1825 that the common people still would not believe in the first earl's death. They fancied that, having done something wrong in India, Lord Minto had gone into hiding in

¹ *Fogramia*, realm of *fograms* or fogues; *click*, loquacious gathering(?); *chack*, a snack; *doup*, buttocks; *ploy*, frolicsome trick; *tint*, lost.—The last line is an echo of the goblin page Gilpin

Horner's often repeated 'Lost! lost! lost!' in *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805).

² George Tancred, *The Annals of a Border Club* (Jedburgh, 1899), p. 185.

'a suite of secret apartments' in his rebuilt house. 'He often walks about the woods and crags of Minto at night with a white nightcap, and long white beard.'

Remembering Tom Campbell, who 'lived at Minto, but... suspected slights, and so on, where no such thing was meant', and his own early visits, Scott reflected somewhat regretfully: 'I knew him very intimately in the beginning of the century and which was very agreeable was much at his house on very easy terms.'¹ Gone were the carefree days of Pandemonium parlour sports in which the first earl indulged the animal spirits of his children and of lively, poetical guests.

COLEMAN O. PARSONS

NEW YORK

THE CONCISE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

In the October number of *The Modern Language Review* (XXXVII, 492), Miss Batho, reviewing Mr George Sampson's excellent *Concise History*, calls attention to a few oversights 'for possible correction later'. It may perhaps be allowable to add a few further notes with the same hope.

On p. 163 *The Defence of Conny-Catching* (1592) is cited as Greene's: but surely this is 'Cuthbert Cony-Catcher's' 'confutation of those two iniurious pamphlets published by R.G.', in which Greene is accused of swindling the theatrical companies he wrote for.

On p. 195 it may be through compression that it is made to appear that Greville's *Caelica* 'sonnets' were printed 'for the first time' in the *Remains* of 1670: they appeared of course in the *Works* of 1633.

Page 277. Surely it was Alleyn not Henslowe who 'paid fivepence for a copy of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*'.

On p. 288 we are told that Chettle 'apologized in his own *Kind Harts Dreame* (1593) to the two anonymous dramatists (most probably Marlowe and Shakespeare) who had been special objects of Greene's malignity' in his *Groatsworth of Wit*. Greene's malignity towards Shakespeare is more than a probability, and Chettle's apology to him seems sincere. But it is difficult to see malignity in Greene's allusion to Marlowe's 'admired inuentions', and if, as it would seem, Marlowe did 'take offence' at something Greene wrote, Chettle's remark that he was not acquainted with him and 'I care not if I neuer be' reads more like an insult than an apology.

Page 299. *Every Man out of his Humour* was printed in 1600 not 1601.

Page 300. Jonson printed *Bartholomew Fayre* (or rather *Bartholomew Fayre*, if Mr Sampson wishes to retain the original spelling) in 1631, though it is true that it was first published 'in posthumous folio' of 1640.

Page 309. It is true that years later Heywood asserted that his *Queen Elizabeth* (1*If you Know not Me*, 1605) had been pirated by stenography, but it is very doubtful whether his knowledge or memory was correct (see *The Library*, 1933, xiv, 313).

Page 325. There is no doubt that 'Lo.' before Barry's name has been wrongly expanded to 'Lodowick', but it now seems likely that the Lording Barry who was connected with the Whitefriars theatre in 1608 and presumably wrote *Ram Alley* for the Children of the King's Revels there, was not 'Lord' David Barry, but the son of one Nicholas Barry and his wife Anne Lording born in 1580 (see C. L'Estrange Ewen in *N. and Q.* 11 Feb. 1938, p. 111).

Page 334. Mr Sampson will of course have noticed that since he wrote the

¹ *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott* 1825-26, ed. J. G. Tait (Edinburgh and London, 1939), pp. 54-6.

mythical name of Salathiel Pavy has been reduced by Dr G. E. Bentley to the more prosaic Salomon (*T.L.S.* 30 May 1942).

Page 335. I think 'pseudo-Shakespearean' is a misleading epithet for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, even allowing for the sceptical position taken up on p. 276, which seems to me unjustified.

On p. 340 we read: 'The Elizabethan and Jacobean period has left us three other masterpieces of the kind, *The Faithful Shepherdess* of Fletcher, *The Sad Shepherd* of Jonson, and the *Amyntas* of Thomas Randolph.' None of these can possibly date from Elizabeth's reign and only one can with any confidence be ascribed to that of James. Fletcher's play was presumably written in 1609: Randolph's can hardly be earlier than 1630: the original date of Jonson's is uncertain, but the prologue assigns it to the last years of his life.

On p. 356 'successive triplets of ten, eight and twelve syllables' is a misleading description of the form of Benlowes's *Theophila*, as the quotation shows.

Page 688. A 'Cambridge' history should at least give the facts about the editing of the 'Cambridge' Shakespeare correctly.

W. W. GREG

PETWORTH

THE DATE OF THE 'CENT NOUVELLES NOUVELLES'

Mr John H. Watkins, in his note contributed on the above subject to the October number, has written: 'However, there is yet another reference which hitherto seems to have escaped notice', and goes on to cite 'the famous *Farce de Pathelin*'.

This reference, however, had not escaped the vigilance of Monsieur Pierre Champion, whose edition of *Les Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, published by Droz in 1928 as tome v of *Documents artistiques du XVe siècle*, appears to be wholly unknown to your contributor.

For reasons connected with the identity of the 'conteurs' and with internal references to historical events, Monsieur Champion narrows the limits of date for the recounting of the tales down to the period 1456-61. The date of the compilation of the actual volume he sets down as 1462, the date on the Hunterian MS. (1432) being the result 'de la mauvaise lecture des chiffres arabes'.

Monsieur Champion draws a different conclusion from that reached by Mr Watkins. The date of *Pathelin* must conform to the date of the *Nouvelles* and not *vice-versa*. In note 3 to p. xviii he writes: 'Voir dans le commentaire ce que nous avons dit à propos d'une allusion à *Pathelin*, farce qui selon nous est antérieure à la rédaction des Cent Nouvelles, c'est-à-dire à 1462.' On p. 277, under Nouvelle 33, he gives the following note: 'G. Baillé de l'oye. V. Baillé de l'oignon. Ce passage est important et semble prouver que la *Farce de Pathelin* est antérieure à la rédaction des *Cent Nouvelles*, c'est-à-dire à 1462. L. Cons, *L'auteur de la farce de Pathelin*, 1926, p. 18-21, avait donné comme date de la farce les termes extrêmes, 1464-1469. Le sens est "on m'a bien trompé".' [G. represents the Glasgow MS., V. Vérard's printed edition.]

Monsieur Champion, with a wealth of argument, decides that Philippe Pot, Seigneur de la Roche, was the compiler of the tales, a conclusion already reached, on unknown grounds, by Abbé Bissey, and hinted at by the late P. Henderson Aitken, in the index, but not in the text, of his elaborate Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Hunterian Library (Glasgow, 1908).

W. R. CUNNINGHAM

GLASGOW

G. R. WECKHERLIN AND THE 'CHOYCE OF A WIFE'

Towards the end of Weckherlin's first English period (1608-15) the greatest sensation in English internal affairs was probably the celebrated case of the poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury. An intelligent young foreign diplomat would naturally be interested in this affair and its revealing background of Court intrigues. There is no direct mention of the Overbury case in Weckherlin's works or extant correspondence. He did, however, evidently know the literature of the subject and particularly Overbury's work, *A Wife*, published in 1614, with the addition, in the second and subsequent impressions, of the *Characters* and a number of complimentary poems. The book enjoyed a *succès de scandale* and ran through five editions in 1614 alone.¹ Among the additions to the fourth impression was Sir Henry Wotton's poem, 'The Character of a Happy Life'. Weckherlin translated this poem and published his version in the first volume of the *Oden und Gesänge* in 1618. He was personally acquainted with Wotton, so that this translation does not of itself show that he knew *A Wife* or the Overburian *Characters*.² The poem 'Meine Meinung wie ein Weib zu wölen'³ does, however, indicate interest in the problem of the choice of a wife on Overburian lines. Nor was this interest entirely academic, as Weckherlin at this period was courting Elizabeth Raworth, the daughter of the Mayor of Dover, whom he later married.⁴ In her he appears to have found suitably embodied the requirements expressed in his poem.

These requirements, however, did not originate with him. 'Meine Meinung wie ein Weib zu wölen' is a free rendering of a poem entitled 'Of the Choyce of a Wife', which appears without indication of authorship among the complimentary verses prefaced to the second and later impressions of Overbury's *Wife*.⁵ The anonymous poem is a summary of Overbury's more ambitious work, but is more practical and realistic in tendency and expression. It was probably just this quality which commended it to Weckherlin's attention. The personal note which he introduced into the title—'Meine Meinung wie ein Weib zu wölen'—indicates that the poem represented his own views.

Parallel texts follow:

Meine Meinung, wie ein Weib zu wölen

Mich zu entfreyhen, und ein weib
(Ja vilmehr meinen leib) zufreyhen,
Das ihr leib mein, mein leib ihr bleib,
Und es mich nicht mög wider reuen:
Glaub ich, ich soll vertrauen nicht
Eines anderen mund noch gesicht:
Zu buhlen und sich selbs zu preisen
Kann ein man selbs das best erweisen.

Of the Choyce of a Wife

If I were to chuse a woman,
As who knowes but I may marry?
I would trust the eye of no man,
Nor a tongue that may miscarry:
For in way of love and glory
Each tongue best tells his owne story.

¹ W. J. Paylor, *The Overburian Characters* (Percy Reprints, no. XIII), Oxford, 1936, p. xxxii.

² No. 52 in Hermann Fischer's standard edition (*Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins zu Stuttgart*, cxcix, cc, ccxlv). His personal acquaintance with Wotton at this time is apparent from the ode, 'An etc. Herrn Heinrich Wotton, Engelländischen Rittern etc.', Fischer, no. 85.

³ Fischer, no. 105; the 31st ode in *O. II* (1619).

⁴ Cp. L. Forster, 'G. R. Weckherlin in

England', *German Life and Letters*, III, 107; Fischer, *Bibl. Lit. Ver.* CCXLV, pp. 23, 42.

⁵ Edward F. Rimbault, *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury, Knt.*, London, 1856, pp. 25 ff. For the general background compare Irmgard von Ingersleben, *Das Elisabethanische Ideal der Ehefrau bei Overbury* (1613) (Neue Anglistische Arbeiten), v, Kothlen, 1924.

Damit nu die wahl khun und frey,
 So wolt ich anfanglich begehren,
 Das Sie solcher Eltern kind sey,
 Die an freyheit, frombkeit und ehren
 Alter dan ein altes geschlecht.
 Eine schonheit fromb und nicht schlecht,
 Auch ein schlechtes und rechtes leben
 Kan selten das blut allein geben.

Zwar waiß ich wol, das gute zweig
 Noch von alten baumen aufschlessen,
 Zu deren lob ich nicht verschweig
 Das Sie Ihres stammes geniessen,
 Und darumb wehrt, das man sie ehr:
 Doch vermain ich auch, das ie mehr
 Ein berg sich in die hohin strocket
 Ie balder er mit schnee bedöcket.

Furchtloß nu vor der Rew zu sein,
 Die uns zu spaht doch bald erschleichtet,
 Soll meine wahl nicht auf den schein,
 Sondern recht nutzlich sein bereichet.
 Wer seine freyheit gibt dahn
 Umb Stands oder gesichts gewin,
 Der kauffet ein pferd zu prachtieren
 Darauf er schimpflich mag verlieren.

Iedoch wolt ich Sie an statur
 Und an schönheit vollkommen haben,
 Auch das Sie solt (schon von Natur)
 Eines Ieden gesicht erlaben:
 Gleich wie die Sonn solt Sie schön sein,
 Das Sie mit unbeflecktem schein,
 Zwar von allen augen gesehen,
 Mog doch nur bey mir nidergehen.

[So darf Sie auch nicht sein gelehrt,
 Vil weniger sprachen studieren;
 Der verstand des weibs ist vil wehrt,
 Der gnug ist Ihr hauß gnug zuzieren:
 Die nur ein solches gesprach hab
 Als ein köstliche Gottes gaab;
 Und mehr nicht dan mein thun und lassen
 (Als mein spiegel) in sich thu fassen.]

Ja, ich wolt nicht das Sie mit glumpf
 Solt iemand wollen lang vexieren,
 Vil weniger mit spot und schimpf
 Iemand verlachen und stumpfieren:
 Sie sol fürchten bose anblick,
 Vilmehr böser geberden stuck,
 Böse buhler fürchten zu machen
 Ihr für-zu-bringen bose sachen.

Das Sie niemahl ab dem werd roht
 Was sie begangen und versaumet;
 Das Sie sey keusch, ohn schand und spot,
 Das Ihr ie nichts böses getraumet.
 Dan die Jungfraw in deren brust
 Sich einmahl nistet böser lust,
 Die hat, eh Sie thut böse thaten,
 Ihrer zucht vöstung schon verrathen.

First, to make my choice the bolder,
 I would have her childe to such,
 Whose free vertuous lives are older
 Then antiquity can touch:
 For 'tis seldom seene, that bloud
 Gives a beauty great and good.

Yet an ancient stock may bring
 Braunches, I confesse, of worth,
 Like rich mantles shadowing
 Those descents that brought them forth;
 Yet such hills, though gilded show,
 Soonest feele the age of snow.

Therefore to prevent such care
 That repentance soone may bring,
 Like marchants, I would choose my ware,
Use-full good, not glittering.
 He that weds for state or face
 Buys a horse, to lose a race.

Yet I would have her faire as any,
 But her owne not kist away,
 I would have her free to many,
 Look on all like equal day;
 But descending to the sea
 Make her set with none but me.

[If she be not tall, 'tis better;
 For that word, *A goodly woman*
 Prints it self in such a letter
 That it leaves unstudied no man:
 * I would have my mistris grow
 Onely tall, to answer *No*.]

Yet I would not have her lose
 So much breeding, as to fling
 Unbecoming scorne on those
 That must worship everything.
 Let her feare loose looks to scatter:
 And loose men will feare to flatter.

Children I would have her beare,
 More for love of name than bed:
 So each child I have is heyre
 To another mayden-head;
 For she that in the act's afraid
 Every night's another maid.

Sie soll stehts mit forcht, scham und ehr
 Wan ich sie besuch, der lieb pflegen:
 Doch wolt ich das sie fruchtbar war,
 Zwar mehr Namens dan wollusts wegen:
 Dan die so in dem werck schamhaft
 Hat stehts ein neue Jungfrawschaft;
 Und die Zucht kan die Trew erhalten,
 Das der Heurath nicht kan veralten.

Sie soll, wan sie mir gibt die hand
 Vor dem Pfarrern, in Ihr hertz graben,
 Wie durch dises hailige band
 Got auß uns beed nur eins woll haben;
 Wünschend mit mir aus hertzen grund,
 Das wir beed in gleicher stund
 (Als Aarons steck) zumahl auf erden
 Grünen, bluen, tragen, dirr werden.

It will be seen that Weckherlin has transposed the eighth and ninth stanzas of the original and has not rendered the sixth and tenth stanzas at all. In place of the sixth he has inserted one of his own, but there is no formal substitute for the tenth. Weckherlin's sixth stanza appears to be a variation on the following verses from Overbury's *Wife*:¹

Give me next *good*, an understanding Wife,
 By nature wise, not *learned* by much art,
 Some *knowledge* on her side, will all my life
 More scope of conversation impart:
 Besides, her inborne vertue fortifie.
 They are most firmly good, that best know why...
Domesticke charge doth best that sex befit,
 Contiguous businesse;...

Assuming that an edition of the *Wife* was the source both for the poem treated here and for the translation of 'The Character of a Happy Life', Weckherlin cannot well have used an earlier impression than the fourth, which is the first to contain the originals of both. This he could have seen in England, as it appeared in the latter part of 1614,² whereas he did not return to Württemberg until 1615.

Weckherlin as usual has enlarged on his model. The English poem is not great verse; it is derivative in every respect and the diction is often clumsy. There is, none the less, a certain neatness and polish about it which is lacking in Weckherlin's rather laboured adaptation. It is a measure of the difference between the product, however inferior, of a living and still vital tradition of diction and versification firmly established and the product of an effort to start a similar tradition with very little native background. When this poem was written the festivities of the Court of Württemberg were still being celebrated in the discursive *Knittelvers* in the style of Hans Sachs.³ This rendering is a preparation for the more finished and easily

Such a one, as when she's woo'd
 Blushes not for ill thoughts past;
 But so innocently good,
 That her dreams are ever chaste,
 For that maid that thinks a sin
 Has betrayd the fort shee's in.

In my visitation still,
 I would have her scatter feares,
 How this man, and that was ill,
 After protestations teares:
 And who vowes a constant life
 Crowns a meritorious Wife.

When the priest first gives our hands,
 I would have her thinke but thus;
 In what high and holy bands
 Heaven, like twins, hath planted us.
 That like *Aarons* rod, together
 Both may bud, grow greene, and wither.

¹ Rimbault, op. cit. pp. 40-1.

² Paylor, loc. cit.

³ Compare Johann Oettinger, *Fürstlicher Württembergischer Ritterscher Pomp und Solennität*, Stuttgart, 1607; Jacobus Frischlin,

Wahrhafte Erzählung und Beschreibung in 6. Bücher außgetheilet des Einritts und Ankunfft zu der fürstlichen württembergischen Kindstauff, etc., 1616, Württembergische Landesbibliothek MS. Cod. hist. fol. 34.

flowing productions with which Weckherlin was to inaugurate a new style of court poetry in southern Germany. It cannot be said to be a very promising one.

The addition of the extra couplet to the stanza of the original largely destroys the neat epigrammatic turn which is an important structural feature of the English. This is the price which is paid in most cases for more room within the stanza. Weckherlin fills it, according to his habit, with parallelism and particularization, in themselves not displeasing (compare verse 5). Often, however, he has too much space left over and is compelled to resort to padding such as 'Zu deren lob ich nicht verschweig', 'Doch vermain ich auch', etc. In cases where he has kept to the structure of the original and rendered one English couplet by two of his own the result is very happy. The English maxim appears as a German *Priamel*:

Wer seine freyheit gibt dahin
Umb Stands oder gesichts gewin,
Der kauffet ein pferd zu prachtieren
Darauf er schimpflich mag verlieren.

He that weds for state or face
Buys a horse, to lose a race. (Verse 4.)

It was evidently the subject-matter rather than the form and expression of the English poem which interested Weckherlin. This is indicated not only in his treatment of the structure of the original and the space left for additions and expansions, but also in his variations and adaptations of the matter. The substitution of the praise of domestic virtues for the dispraise of handsome appearance and quickness of tongue¹ in Weckherlin's verse 6, the omission of the *motif* of 'each childe I have is heyre To another mayden-head' in verse 8 of the English (Weckherlin's verse 9); the compression of part of the subject-matter of verse 10 of the English into verse 9 of the German and the omission of all treatment of the rest of the verse; these are cases in point and more may be found.

As a poem, Weckherlin's version is a failure. It cannot compare with some of his contemporary renderings of English poetry, notably those of Wotton's 'Character of a Happy Life' and of some pastoral pieces.² In point of technical achievement it barely reaches the level of the best of his own English compositions in the *Triumphall Shews* or the *Panegyricke to the Lord Hays*. It was evidently a practice piece, chosen because its subject had a personal interest for the poet at the time.³

LEONARD FORSTER

CAMBRIDGE

¹ For the play on the word *tall*, cp. *N.E.D.* s.v. *Tall*, § 1, 2, 6 and § 1, 4.

² For a general treatment see Wilhelm Böhm, *Englands Einfluss auf Georg Rudolf Weckherlin*, Diss. Göttingen, 1893.

³ This article supplements and corrects passages in chapters 2 and 3 of my thesis *Georg Rodolphe Weckherlin, Beiträge zu seiner Biographie*, publication of which is held up by war conditions.

REVIEWS

The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. A Survey of the Foundations of the Text.

By W. W. GREG. Oxford. Clarendon Press 1942. iv + 210 pp. 12s. 6d.

Since the present era of Shakespearean textual scholarship opened with the publication in 1909 of Dr A. W. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* much work has been done by various investigators, and, although a great deal is still to be done, a point has been reached from which one may profitably look back and consider what may be regarded with fair confidence as established, what mistakes have been made, what remains for future study. The volume before us represents 'an attempt to sum up the present state of critical opinion regarding the foundations of Shakespeare's text'. In all his writing Dr Greg has invariably refused to make dogmatic statements upon inadequate evidence and has always been ready to allow that a given matter is in doubt. In this book he emphasizes 'the provisional character of the conclusions presented', and it would be unfair to him to omit to stress this here. Yet his prudence increases the force of his admissions. He says, 'In respect of the wider questions at issue I do, indeed, feel some confidence that we have now reached a just estimation of the documents before us, but no corresponding certainty can be claimed for the detailed criticism of individual texts.' Individual texts remain to be studied and they will be studied, but it is a cheering fact that a scholar of Dr Greg's cautious outlook considers that as regards the wider questions a not unsatisfactory position has been reached. To Dr Greg himself is due a substantial share of the credit for the fact that this position has indeed been reached.

The contents of his latest book are in the main those of the Clark lectures delivered by him in Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1939. The text has been revised and some notes and references have been added along with an appendix concerning stage directions. There is a further addition, of fundamental significance. Shortly after the lectures were delivered there were published the highly important *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* by the late Dr R. B. McKerrow, by whose death contemporary Shakespearean scholarship has lost one of its most distinguished leaders. McKerrow's *Prolegomena* have been received with well-merited cordiality, and Dr Greg records his admiration of them: he considers that McKerrow's book contains 'by far the most helpful and authoritative discussion of [editorial method] in relation to Shakespeare that we possess'. Nevertheless, he has some radical criticisms to make. He does not question 'that the principles [McKerrow] laid down were the best for the particular edition he had in view, and considering the particular circumstances of the case'; but he is 'less convinced that they are perfectly suited to produce the ideal text that shall approach as closely to the author's manuscript as modern methods of criticism allow'. Consequently he prefixes to his lectures *prolegomena* of his own which, in certain respects agreeing with those of McKerrow, in other respects amplify and modify them. I have space to mention only two cases in point. To McKerrow's classification of the early texts into 'substantive' and 'derived' editions Dr Greg adds a third category not explicitly recognized as such by McKerrow, viz. 'mixed' texts: e.g. a given extant edition (*x*) may have been printed from a copy of another extant edition (*y*), but this copy of *y* may have received scribal additions and alterations taken from a non-extant source (*z*). In such a case *x* is derived in the sense that it is printed from an earlier extant edition, but clearly the importations from *z* are substantive and they may be sufficiently extensive to give *x* substantive status on the whole. Again, McKerrow recommended the 'conservative' editorial method even as regards plays of which we have two or more substantive texts; according to him, having in such cases decided upon the most authoritative text in general, an editor should adopt its readings in all

instances except corruptions manifest in themselves without reference to any other substantive text. Dr Greg argues with great cogency for the alternative editorial method of 'restricted eclecticism'. Even in the case of a text printed from the author's autograph there are potential corrupting agents in the compositor and press reader: a genuine reading, corrupted by one or other of these, may survive in another substantive text of less authority in general: and the corruption may not be self-evident. Thus an editor must be prepared to reject a reading in the most authoritative text for that of another substantive text of less authority in general; but the decision to do so must be made only 'in obedience to a clear and reasoned view of the relevant textual conditions'—hence the qualification 'restricted'. In case of doubt the reading of the text of greatest authority in general is to be preferred. I find Dr Greg's argument for the controlled eclectic principle completely convincing: the strict conservative method is applicable only to plays existing in a single substantive edition (and with no authoritative additions or alterations in any derived edition). To speak of Dr Greg's prolegomena as a whole, I believe that there has never been produced so complete and sound a statement of editorial principles applied to Shakespeare as is given here, and this in itself renders the book one of the most important ever published on a Shakespearian subject.

The lectures themselves are of high value. The whole canon is surveyed textually, some plays in greater detail than others. The work of the last thirty years is dispassionately sifted. Some theories evolved during that time are rejected, e.g. those of 'continuous copy' and 'assembled texts'. Others are temperately approved. What is doubtful is unhesitatingly stated to be doubtful. Arguments are conducted with restraint and moderation, and critical insight is evidenced on every page.

In the first lecture Dr Greg deals with the change in the critical attitude to the quartos and the folio consequent on the work of Dr Pollard. In the second he summarizes what is known about dramatic manuscripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from extant examples. In the third he deals with those Shakespearian plays which are extant in a bad quarto in addition to one or more authentic texts.

Dr Greg is himself responsible for some of the most significant work which has been done on the bad quartos—witness his examinations of the reported texts of *Merry Wives* in 1910 and Greene's *Orlando* in 1923. It is interesting to note that in the present volume he casts doubt on two of his earlier findings as regards *Q Merry Wives*. He formerly identified the reporter as an actor who had played the part of the Host: he now regards it as perhaps safer to assume 'an independent reporter relying generally on mine Host's assistance'. He also suspects his earlier view that the last act of *Q* relies on an original distinct from the *F* version. Many fascinating points arise in connection with this lecture, but I must content myself with a note on the view taken of *The Taming of a Shrew* (*Q*). Dr Greg regards it as 'clearly derivative' and says that 'it would seem that all the writer had to go upon was a fairly full synopsis of *F* [*The Taming of the Shrew*] together with a few recollections or perhaps reported fragments of the dialogue'. Dr Greg is thus in line with Hickson, Smart, and Alexander. In my own opinion the most satisfactory hypothesis of the relationship between *Q* and *F* is essentially that advanced (but not demonstrated) by ten Brink in 1878. I believe that it can be shown that *F* is a reworking of an earlier Shakespearian or partly Shakespearian play, and that *Q* is memorially based on this earlier play. In the main plot the earlier play was in or near its final state, but the sub-plot was further from its final state: and the *Sly* framework was probably complete as in *Q*.

The fourth lecture is concerned with *Richard III* and *Lear*. The *Q* texts show various characteristics of reporting, but they cannot be classed with the undoubted bad quartos—they are of another order in the uniform maintenance of a standard of fullness and accuracy high for reported texts. Dr Greg agrees with Dr D. L.

Patrick in regarding *Q Richard III* as essentially based on the F text: he suggests that, playing in the provinces with a reduced personnel and without the prompt-book, the Chamberlain's Men 'reconstructed it by an effort of communal memory, adapting it at the same time to altered circumstances'. I am confident that this theory is sound. I am less happy about Dr Greg's view of the transmission of *Q Lear*. He regards this text as a stenographic report taken by means of John Willis's shorthand system, available since 1602. I have examined this system and must set it down as my honest opinion that it could not have been used with the speed and efficiency necessary to produce during performance a text on the level of that of *Q Lear*. It might be more satisfactory to adopt for *Q Lear* a hypothesis similar to the above for *Q Richard III*. There are difficulties, but I think they can be surmounted. Dr Greg postulates for *Q Lear* copy without verse-line division. If actors dictated the play to a scribe the words might be given out in groups not coinciding with verse lines so that the scribe, unable to distinguish between verse and prose, might simply write everything as prose. Again, within the speeches practically the only punctuation mark is the comma and commas are sometimes badly misplaced. Punctuation would not be dictated and the scribe, working in haste, might simply put in a comma on his own responsibility after every few words. It might even be that the scribe used John Willis's stenographic system. What I find impossible to credit is that the text was taken down in shorthand *during performance*. I should expect the stenographer to get lost when the passion of the actors rose and the speed of elocution increased. I should expect him to get tired and so less efficient as the play went on. but I can find no variation in the standard of reporting which bears any relation to these factors. The dictation of a text to a scribe would not of course present the same conditions as a performance: the speed of delivery could be accommodated to the scribe's requirements, and the work could be done in stages. It is only fair to emphasize that Dr Greg is himself not very comfortable about his theory of shorthand reporting during performance.

I have no space to discuss details in connexion with the remaining lectures. Suffice it to say that these are packed with material as interesting as that of the preceding ones. This is indeed a book which the student of Shakespeare's text will consult on whatever play he happens to be studying. Dr Greg has given us a worthy successor to the series of vitally important works by means of which he has influenced contemporary Shakespearean textual scholarship so profoundly

G. I. DUTHIE

BRISTOL

London in Flames, London in Glory; Poems on the Fire and Rebuilding of London 1666-1709. Edited by ROBERT ARNOLD AUBIN. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. 1943. xvi+381 pp. \$4.50.

The historian should welcome this book with its valuable notes on the catastrophic event of the Great Fire, but I am not sure that the literary historian should not be equally grateful. For its thirty-two poems or tirades on the burning of London and the rebuilding illustrate the vulgar idiom of poetry at a supremely interesting period, that is, the transition from the Metaphysical to the neoclassic idiom. We are thus able to place Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* (not included by Mr Aubin) in its true literary setting, and to note how close that great poet keeps to contemporary fashions and yet how he rises sheer above them by his instinctive artistry.

Mr Aubin is not so much interested in the literary aspects of his anthology and small wonder, for the great majority of the poems are doggerel, 'products of the Pie Corner muse', written by solid citizens or journalists and 'smacking of the City'. Fortunately for us the journalist in Dryden could not avoid the theme. We also have witnessed a burning of London, but, so far as one hears, no muse, vulgar

or gentle, has troubled to express London's lamentations. Any lucubrations of the kind would indeed have been felt to be an impertinence in the ordeal of 1940-1.

These 'lamentations' show how 'Gothic' London was even in the late seventeenth century. The wits had rid themselves of superstitious interpretation of phenomena, but not the people who were much what they had been in the plague years in Elizabethan and Jacobean times, and certainly not the preachers. Bishop Sprat indeed will not hear of the Fire being made an occasion to enlarge on our neighbour's vices, but Sancroft and Richard Baxter are equally persuaded that the Fire was God's vengeance on backsliding, though these worthy clergies would interpret backsliding differently, as most men did, that is, according to party and sect. For the vulgar it was sufficient to explain that the Fire was a judgement on London's gluttony—did not it start at Pudding Lane and end at Pie Corner?

In most of these sorry productions the Monarch appears to best advantage—

The Rebel-Flames, they say, felt Charles was there;
And sneaking back, grew tamer then they were.

What rich opportunity for bathos the Fire offered! The Duke of York, too, 'with sweat and dirt besmeared', took a hand at the pumps. Royalty must show itself at such moments. What astonishes and moves us is the filial piety of Londoners to their common mother. She is Jerusalem despoiled by the idolators, she is Troy sacked and burned, she is 'Sion wept by Jeremie', the 'dear Mother the city of London, who now sits as a widow'. The expression was less lyrical and mythical, but everyone knows that in its late ordeal the feeling for London was every whit as intense.

All these and other relevant matters are fully discussed by Mr Aubin in his exhaustive notes. It has obviously been for him a labour of love, and well it might be. I still think, however, that he might have made more of the literary aspect of this collection. He might have shown how Dryden drew the greater part of his bizarre imagery and the poetical idiom for his picture of the Fire from these popular effusions. But no doubt an editor must be left to choose his point of view, which in Mr Aubin's case is historical and antiquarian. All honour to his brave attempt to make the past live!

GEORGE KITCHIN

EDINBURGH

The Background of Thomson's Seasons. By ALAN DUGALD MCKILLOP. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: Milford. 1942. viii + 192 pp. \$2.50.

One wishes that 'source-hunting' more often showed the control and direction evident in Professor McKillop's book. This is no mere list of Thomson's borrowings, but a large contribution to our understanding of what the eighteenth century was about in its poetry. It comes opportunely to join recent work on the literary influence of Locke and Shaftesbury, on *Grongar Hill*, and on Thomson's own career.

The Seasons has ceased to interest mainly as a portent of a 'Romantic Revival' seventy years distant. No doubt the early review reprinted by Professor McKillop must be partly discounted as a puff, but with the disinterested comments of the magazines it proves that the poem was felt, not as a revolution in method, but as a perfectly recognizable form with a familiar message—the didactic or reflective poem on beneficent Providence. This treatise succeeds in showing how closely observation of nature links up with the prevailing ideas of physico-theology. Nature enters, not in her own right, but as the revealer of cosmic design, of the grand chain of being. In this context the vogue of *Job* in paraphrase and quotation, of night-thoughts on death, of idyllic pictures of contemplative retirement like Pomfret's much-read *The*

Choice, gain new significance. Thomson's advance from literary generalization to stricter alinement with the philosophy of Derham keeps pace with growing detail in description. The science and geography so lavishly used bring with them sharper ideas about nature's nicely linked processes and man's happy progress.

Professor McKillop's conjectures on Thomson's reading are impressively supported by the poet's library list, since discovered in the Mitchell Library, Glasgow. Among the titles are many more histories and records of travel in four continents. There is clearly still a field for search.

Within its limits this painstaking study inspires confidence; but some corrections of perspective may be offered. A freer use of the popular essays (e.g. 'A Dream of Seasons', *Spectator*, 425; 'On Nature and Death', *Guardian*, 169—both perhaps Pope's) might have set the stage more fittingly for Thomson's easy-going eclecticism. And what of the perennial Scots zest for 'edification', and nature poetry? It is curious too that no use is made of George Buchanan. Ruddiman's edition (used by Thomson) had just revived memories of his European primacy, and his bust ornamented Thomson's title-pages. *De Sphaera*, III, has, besides other geography, the Brazilian Paradise of *Summer*, 851 ff. Finally, by the 1720's 'description' had itself become a defined topic in writings on epic and other poetic forms and in collections of poetic 'beauties', and here Thomson's keen practical and historical interest in painting, and the discussions (revived by Dubos and others) on *ut pictura poesis* and artistic presentation of ideas, are strictly relevant.

J. C. BRYCE

GLASGOW

Nineteenth Century Studies. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS, WILLIAM C. DEVANE, R. C. BALD. Ithaca; New York: Cornell University Press. 1940. ix + 303 pp. \$3.00.

This interesting collection of critical studies, by past or present members of the Department of English at Cornell, has been designed as a salute to Professor C. S. Northup, to whom it is dedicated, upon his retirement 'after fifty years at Cornell as undergraduate, teacher and scholar'. The gesture gives pleasure to more than Professor Northup, and the contents of the book indicate the strength in scholarship of this Department in a great American University, even within the limits of a century of our literature.

The eight essays in the book are mainly concerned with literary influences in a variety of aspects, except for Professor L. N. Broughton's transcript with commentary of some unpublished early nineteenth-century letters, some in his own possession but mostly from the Wordsworth Collection in Cornell University, from or to Coleridge, Wordsworth, Allsop, Mrs Gillman, Southey. They are of unequal interest, of course, but there is valuable information about the origin of *Biographia Literaria*.

Professor Bald works upon certain note-books of Coleridge which were not accessible to Professor Lowes for his *Road to Xanadu*, and which illustrate Coleridge's ways of thought and imagination. They afford material for retrospective interpretation of *The Ancient Mariner*, with hints upon revision, from records of Coleridge's voyage to Malta in 1804. The effects of opium are further studied, in relation to *The Ancient Mariner*, with especial reference to the stimulation of extreme vividness of colour-sense. And Mr Bald raises pertinent questions about the 'Well' of the subconscious, for no one was more aware than Coleridge, the student of Hartley, of the force of association. Nor did any poet more deliberately, consciously, and exhaustively prepare himself by reading and study for his writing. Mr Bald very properly adduces the evidence of Wordsworth upon this question (pp. 20-1). The

concluding discussion of Coleridge's use of the word 'reverie' and of his addiction to opium is closely related to this general question, and is of high interest.

Professor DeVane's lively paper upon 'Browning and the Spirit of Greece' discusses the difficulty of reconciling an Evangelical outlook or Progressiveness with the Greek spirit, and analyses Browning's attempt to find a kindred soul in Euripides, so much admired by Mrs Browning too. He also traces the pervasive presence of Browning's favourite Andromeda myth, with its autobiographical significance for him and for Elizabeth Barrett, even in so unlikely a place as in *The Ring and the Book*. Arnold was, of course, enough to rouse opposition in a less combative temperament than Browning's, but Browning loses stature in his depreciation of the Hellenic spirit.

Dr Carlisle Moore's essay on 'Carlyle and Fiction' is illuminating upon the whole of Carlyle's work, especially on *Sartor* and the historical writings. Dr F. D. Curtin has much of importance to say upon the influence of Ruskin's aesthetic thought in later social theory and practice, while Dr C. T. Bissell writes on *The Way of All Flesh* as a dramatization of a philosophy of life, with a biological approach to its problems—a forerunner of much modern thought. Dr H. S. L. Wiener gives an account of Byron's underlying reading for his 'Turkish Tales' and of his care for detail in his pictures of Oriental life, with much dependence on illustrative notes in sources like *Vathek* or *The Arabian Nights*. Finally, Dr Oscar Maurer, Jr., writes upon the conflict between the aesthetes and the social reformers for possession of Morris, which became evident after the publication of *Jason* and *The Earthly Paradise*, with a list of contemporary reviews of these poems. The field of these studies is wide, and their manner and contents varied. But all have quality, scholarship, and interest. One could wish that it had been possible to append a bibliography of Professor Northup's writings, to complete a worthy tribute to a colleague and master in a notable school of English studies.

C. J. Sisson

LONDON

Hommage à Bédier. By E. VINAVER. Manchester: Éditions du Calame. 1942. 27 pp.

This is a thoughtful introduction to the mind of a French scholar who has exercised more influence on European criticism than any since Gaston Paris. Of Bédier's greatness there can be no reasonable doubt. He swept away easy formulas and romantic assumptions which were constituting a new mythology of literature. He left solid constructions behind (*Tristan*, epics, textual criticism, fabliaux), but he was at all times sounding the note of Socratic ignorance. Professor Vinaver reproduces two characteristic notes in holograph which illustrate this trait. In one Bédier explains why he can correct *la labaille* to *la bataille* but can express no opinion about *Malprimes* or *Marganices*, about which the tyro would have many an opinion to utter. In the other he recognizes, as so few are willing to do, that old poets wrote poetry rather than philology:

C'est ainsi que fut restitué à la France, non seulement le roman de Tristan, mais aussi et surtout le poète de Tristan, ce poète méconnu dont l'œuvre, réduite par les hasards de la transmission à quelques fragments, avait été disséquée et anéantie par les critiques du siècle dernier. Pour la ressusciter, pour en retrouver le principe vital, il ne suffisait pas de dépouiller les textes: il fallait aussi les comprendre, les aimer, et les revivre; il fallait savoir interpréter la mission d'un philologue comme une tâche poétique, au sens le plus large et le plus élevé du mot.

Professor Vinaver puts the case well: Bédier brought us back to the old poems as poems, the old poets as poets. Yet, when compared with the more adventurous criticism of Gaston Paris, there is a sense of loss. The old master had taken all

western Europe for his field, and his synthesis of our basic civilization was an artistic product in its own right. There are times when Bédier seems to turn his back on Europe and to encourage those who believe in the *autarky* of France. Prudence guides his thought, as a prudent ignorance guided Socrates; but just as physical theory took many ages to recover from Socratic scepticism, so one has an uneasy sense that the old French achievement seems rather less rich when one sees it more precisely defined. Moreover, the new criticism seems likely to develop its own mythology, despite all its prudence, as Plato developed the *Idea* to become a tyrant over science, overthrown at long last by John Locke. Anyone who has read the chapter 'Les seize Guillaumes' will be cured of the practice of picking out obscure names from old manuscripts and juggling with them to explain old plots, but the *Légendes épiques* itself picks out a relatively small number of lines of monastic interest in order to build a theory of the origin of *chansons de geste* in association with monasteries. M. Wilmotte has made judicious comments on this point. Having established this opinion by examination of the first *chanson de geste*, was it really with surprise that Bédier found himself gaining corroboration from each successive poem? Were not his discoveries due to his expectations? There exists, at least, a stronger desire to challenge Bédier than to challenge Gaston Paris, some of whose imaginative constructions commend themselves by their artistic *verisimilitude*. On the personal issue raised, however, Professor Vinaver's answer (based on personal intimacy) is quite clear; Bédier's thought was veritably singulative:

Il aimait les poèmes du douzième siècle, parce qu'il les croyait uniques, parce que chacun d'eux formait un poème, non un chapitre d'histoire littéraire. Un jour il me dit qu'il était incapable de rien comprendre à la philosophie. Aveu révélateur, car rien n'était plus étranger à son esprit que les vastes systèmes littéraires, historiques ou autres. Depuis la publication des *Légendes épiques*, il s'est produit autour de son œuvre un tragique malentendu: des adversaires mal avisés l'ont attaqué comme s'il avait formulé une doctrine; et ses amis, également mal avisés, mais désireux de le défendre, ont accouru au combat.

To its author, then, the *Légendes épiques* does not constitute a doctrine, though a reader cannot fail to be struck by the emergence of the same inference so many times, the book does *seem* to be an example of inductive method as opposed to the deductive approach of Gaston Paris, but the accepted use of induction is to reach general truths. The old formula *φιλοσοφεῖν ἢ μὴ φιλοσοφεῖν φιλοσοφητέον* seems to apply, with all the rigours of a dilemma, in the case of Bédier also. Professor Vinaver gives 'une des rares généralisations qu'on soit en droit de lui attribuer', viz. 'Toute littérature débute par un chef-d'œuvre le quel n'a pas de passé'—a surprising conclusion,—a drastic generalization of most doubtful validity,—and yet implicit *a priori* in the attempt rigorously to consider each poem as unique and self-sufficient.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

Alphonse Daudet as a Dramatist. By GUY RUFUS SAYLOR. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1940. 122 pp.

The plays written by Alphonse Daudet for the stage, as distinct from dramatizations of his novels, have not endured. The only exception is *L'Arlésienne*, which, however, probably owes its lasting appeal to the music of Bizet. Nor did these plays enjoy much more than a *succès d'estime* at the time of their production, save the little one-act piece *La Dernière Idole*, on the triumph of which Daudet dwells with such pride in *Trente Ans de Paris*. Daudet's shortcomings as a playwright are due in part to his dramatic theories and in part to those personal traits which make his short stories so masterly and his long novels so tedious—direct observation

exquisite detail and lack of construction. Preoccupation with documentary realism and revolt against the tyranny of the *pièce bien faite* mean that his longer plays, like his novels, tend to be series of sketches or studies of manners, while his myopic attention to accurate detail leads him to overload these loosely connected scenes with excessively realistic matter. In a novel this episodic construction can be overlooked for the sake of the charming descriptions, amusing though superfluous minor characters and faithful portrayal of manners, but it is a serious drawback in a play, where progressive action and unity of aim are essential.

All this is pointed out by Dr Saylor, and backed up by a wealth of quotations from contemporary and later critics. Indeed, he seems reluctant to hazard even the most general remark without supporting it with a quotation, and this fear of expressing any opinion of his own makes his dissertation rather uphill reading, for every statement being followed by its supporting extract from a critic, the same thing has invariably to be read twice. Moreover this patchwork method is very monotonous, since for each of ten plays the same procedure is adopted and roughly the same critics are invoked. Ten times a protracted narrative of the plot of the play is followed by what Sarcey, Paul de Saint-Victor, Zola, Gélis, Sherard and the rest said about it, after which a balance is struck between these people's opinions.

Dr Saylor's book might have been made more entertaining if he had varied the treatment and relegated the quotations from critics to a chapter of notes at the end, but then possibly the text itself would have been very slight. As a work of reference on the theory and practice of Naturalism on the stage it is very useful.

L. W. TANCOCK

LONDON

Spirit of Flame: a study of St John of the Cross. By E. ALLISON PEERS. London: Student Christian Movement Press. 1943. 163 pp. 6s.

La Poesía de San Juan de la Cruz. By DÁMASO ALONSO. Madrid: Instituto Antonio de Nebrija. 1942. 291 pp. 15 ptas.

The quatercentenary of St John of the Cross may be rated above those of other writers of his age through having inspired these two diversely valuable works. Professor Peers is concerned with the man and saint. He describes (as he has done before, and has more right than any man to do again) the life of St John of the Cross from his birth in the hamlet of Fontiveros, possibly on Midsummer's Day of 1542, to his death in 1591. The narrative is as clear and attractive as any that Professor Peers has written. The second part of the book is given up to the special flavour of St John's personality in verse and mystical thought, and to the removal of stumbling-blocks in the way of the modern, and especially the non-Catholic, reader. These are

(i) The divergence of his standards from those of popular Christianity; (ii) his detachment from both material and spiritual things, (iii) his uncompromising conception or supposed insistence on physical penance, (iv) his supposed indifference to the good of others; (v) his teaching on passivity and on the transformation of the soul in God.

In taking away these difficulties from the path of the average, though spiritually minded, reader, Professor Peers does his work well. There is, however, a suggestion of apology in this method. We are told, indeed, that St John of the Cross was a man of varied attainments, learned and unique in range, unity and method, but we rather remove objections to his thought than view it from any central point. 'To the half-hearted Christian [says Professor Peers] he will make no appeal at all. With such a person he has nothing in common but a name. Nor does he cater for him.' This is a hard saying, and surely cannot be true in its entirety. St John in his own ex-

perience, like Cervantes in another, is an author only to be fully appreciated by those who bring a like experience to their study; but it does not follow that the qualities enumerated above are incapable of description, even before laymen.

Something quite essential has been discovered in this respect by D. Dámaso Alonso. He has not been (fortunately for us) wholly deterred by the words in which Menéndez y Pelayo has placed St John's poetry beyond the pale of literary criticism ('ya no parece de este mundo, ni es posible medirla con criterios literarios'), though admitting that they infused in his heart an 'inicial terror'; but has stated and largely solved the strictly literary problems of the texts, their sources, their literary worth, and the relations between poetry, on the one hand, and mystical experience and exegesis on two others. He has discovered the precise way in which St John's versification and landscape is related to that of Garcilaso de la Vega, namely by direct reading, and by the treatment of the *Égloga segunda a lo divino* by Sebastián de Córdoba. Then follows a minute analysis of the popular and traditional elements in this small body of supreme lyrics, and a technical discussion of clauses and language. This has cleared up many things that are puzzling, not so much to the beginner as to the more experienced reader. What (one asks oneself) is the popular and traditional flavour which one tastes in the *Cántico espiritual*, a poem italianate in metre and of Hebrew inspiration? What is so specifically Castilian in a non-Castilian landscape of

las aves ligeras,
leones, ciervos, gamos saltadores,
montes, valles, riberas,
aguas, aires, ardores,
y miedos de las noches veladores.

where there is not only a garden of 'amenas liras', but one hears the 'canto de serenar'? This is not the 'gigantic altar' of Unamuno, nor the bleak steppe of Antonio Machado. Sr Alonso explains most of this curious difficulty, though I think there remains a point which Professor Peers passes, without quite picking up. Professor Peers contrasts St John's lack of receptiveness 'with the beauties of the Andalusian countryside unveiled before him' with the 'memories of flower-strewn meadows, lonely wooded valleys, rushing rivers, gentle breezes, tranquil nights and the soft approach of the dawn' which thronged his mind 'in the gloom of the prison at Toledo'. But is not this just the point? The light that never was on sea or land shines in the *memory*, empurpling the landscape, whether for an imprisoned St John of the Cross or for a blind Milton. Hence one feels both the essentially Castilian basis of the picture and its vivid imaginative enhancement.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

The Allegorical Drama of Calderón. By ALEXANDER A. PARKER. London and Oxford: Dolphin Book Shop. 1943. 232 pp. 16s.

It is not often that one is tempted to call a book, in all sober scholarship, 'epoch-making'; the word has been virtually surrendered to the penny press, and even there seems to have fallen into some discredit. Yet, to Mr Parker's treatment of the Calderonian *auto*, the word seems (unless I am sadly at fault) proper and merited. He has, in fact, opened up a new highway into Spanish thought of the best era; he has restored to view things rendered dim by the myopia of literary criticism. In his first chapter Mr Parker gives a thorough-going account of 'The *autos* and their critics', indicating many forms of blindness to their purpose and merits, but the break-through (so to speak) is made in the criticism of Menéndez y Pelayo. This is the more important inasmuch as there has been an evident tendency in Spain to deify this scholar in the last five years, and to ignore the good things that have come to light since his time. Menéndez y Pelayo did a giant's work for Spanish scholarship;

without him there would be no body of intelligent interest in Spanish literary subjects, and indeed, apart from him, there is surprisingly little to say about any author. But, though this be so, there is grave intellectual danger in enclosing one's mind with a Chinese wall of Pelagian ideas, for he was, after all, a man like unto ourselves—a man of somewhat lower stature, for instance, than W. von Humboldt or Gaston Paris—and there are some significant values that lie outside his ken.

One of these was Calderón at his best. It is not merely that he defined the sphere of art too narrowly:

Sólo lo humano interesa y emociona al hombre en la esfera teatral, y las alegorías se mueven en la abstracta región de las ideas, adonde no llegan las energías de las pasiones reales, y que, por consiguiente, está por completo fuera de la acción dramática.

The serious defect in Menéndez y Pelayo's criticism arose from his essential scepticism, which revealed itself by a rhetorical exaltation of dogma accompanied by an absolute refusal to discuss it. He says of St John of the Cross, for instance:

Juzgar tales arrobamientos, no ya con el criterio retórico y mezquino de los resacadores de ápices, sino con la admiración respetuosa con que juzgamos una oda de Píndaro o de Horacio, parece irreverencia y profanación.

In such terms he refused over and again to enter into the thought of orthodox writers. Indeed, Menéndez y Pelayo's mental attitude was such as to drive him to distinguish between orthodoxy and thought, and to write a history of Spanish thought under the rubric of *Los Heterodoxos*.

Now, it was not so with Calderón. So far was he from distinguishing between thought and dogma that he found in dogma the only logical result of freely directed thought. He was as essentially a believer, as Menéndez y Pelayo was essentially a sceptic; though both might be reckoned in the class of uncompromising Catholics. What fascinated Calderón and gave eloquence to his pen was the way in which the processes of thought inevitably converged upon the same grand revealed Truth. He had nothing that needed proof, since truth is independent of proof; but he had much to demonstrate, starting from almost any point in the continents of thought and imagery. It is here that he approaches Dante most closely. For Dante science (especially mathematics and metaphysics) is poetry, and he employs calculation and speculation with as much freedom as metaphor and rhythm; poetry for Calderón could be pure syllogism and rhetorical construction. The cardinal Ideas which make up Truth could, for him, really and sensuously live, weaving patterns with their major, minor and conclusion, grouping themselves by proem, proposition, development and exordium into dramas as real and more noble than those of 'Ricardo' and 'Leonarda' and all the other Italianate young ladies and gentlemen of the boards.

The first thing, therefore, required of the reader of Calderón (and how much more of the critic?) is to enter into those ideas which had such verity of life for him. Mr Parker takes us into them in his splendid second chapter, 'The autos as drama'. For this he is qualified by sharing the religion of his subject, and by having taken the precaution of submitting his exposition to a competent theologian. I do not propose to attempt a résumé of his statement, not one word of which has been misplaced. The task was one of delicacy in definition, precise phrasing, and historical insight, since the passage of years has removed Calderón from the ambit even of Catholic ideology; he is perhaps more remote from present-day orthodoxy than is St Thomas Aquinas, who has been restated *secundum essentiam*, if not *per accidens*. In three other chapters Mr Parker works out his position for *El Gran Teatro del Mundo*, *La Cena de Baltasar*, and *La Vida es Sueño*. I wonder if there is something of the Old Adam in Mr Parker which causes him to place the last below the other two? The first has the support of a serviceable metaphor, and the second rests on biblical authority and the exegesis of the Fathers. They are both very fine. Yet to my ear, the fact that they are supported in this way by external experience is some-

what troubling, especially in the second case, as compared with the majestic purity of intellectual action in the final form of *La Vida es Sueño*. In that play the great flaw in the universe, man's sinful election, is revealed in its stark clarity of fact, without any reference to players improvising their parts or a Babylonian monarch certified to be historical; omnipotent Power, omnipotent Wisdom, and omnipotent Love consider in grand antiphones the defiance that Free-will has launched against their omnipotence, and being all-powerful they bring salvation through that very Free-will, by way of Penitence and Grace. This is pure intellectual drama, the unique creation of Calderón. Just as the mind has at least as much life as the body, so there is a kind of action (drama) of thoughts as theatrically effective as that of persons. It is also purely intellectual in form in *La Vida es Sueño*; nothing occurs by external necessity of *mimesis*, but all comes from direct exposition of the theme.

Mr Parker's subject is the *autos*. It should be remembered that Calderón's *comedias* are cut from the cloth of the same mind. The conditions of entry into their purposes are somewhat different, but they too are remote from the merely 'realistic' criteria which alone have yet been applied to them.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

Handbook of Latin American Studies. 1939. Edited by LEWIS HANKE and MIRON BURGIN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1940. xvi+476 pp. 22s 6d

Spanish specialists are not ill-served in the matter of bibliographies, but a notable drawback to their utility is the fact that they are scattered in reviews and learned journals, all of them foreign, a double disadvantage just now. A move in the direction of portable bibliography for Hispano-American studies was made some years ago by the Harvard Council of Hispano-American Studies with their useful series of 'Tentative Bibliographies', Harvard now puts us still further in debt by sponsoring with the aid of the Rockefeller Foundation a new series, which would appear to be planned as a year-book, of which this, the fifth, reaches us rather late, but not the less welcome. The problem in all bibliographical work on modern studies is to avoid the extremes of an obsessional register of every scrap of print on the one hand, and a too subjective criterion of selection on the other. The present volume is 'a selective guide' to publications throughout the world on Latin America, the majority of course from Latin America itself, but the introduction does not tell us on what principles the selection is made, beyond saying that it 'aims to record... the important publications'. Probably these principles are explained in an earlier volume. In any case, the contributors, of whom there are nearly forty, many of them, like the editors, Library of Congress experts, inspire the greatest confidence in the soundness of their criteria. Most of them are North American, but not all, and from the list of acknowledgements it is clear that Latin Americans have contributed a fair share to the enterprise.

The *Handbook* covers a wide field, the entries number 4500, starting with book catalogues, it includes, amongst other headings, eighteen in all, anthropology, art, economics, history (in three subdivisions) and, of course, language and literature, taking these subjects country by country, systematically, according to the nature of the section. For some reason not immediately apparent, Brazilian art is treated as a main category, and not included with the other countries under the general heading. The omission of Brazil from the economics section is, it seems, only accidental and temporary.

A most interesting feature of the *Handbook* is the inclusion of brief notes to the majority of the entries. These, together with the introductions to the sections (Professor Frondizi and Fr. Franca on philosophy are specially attractive), make the

Handbook much more valuable than a merely exhaustive list would be. It appears to be the custom of the editors to include in each volume a 'special article', for 1939 it was *Bibliografía de Índices Bibliográficos relativos a Venezuela* by Sr M. S. Sánchez. Altogether, the production is of the greatest interest and utility, and its chief editor, Mr L. Hanke, and his team of collaborators, deserve our thanks and congratulations. It is to be hoped that the announcement in the introduction that the present volume 'marks the close of the first epoch in the life of this publication' has not meant that subsequent development has been in any way impeded.

E. SARMIENTO

SHEFFIELD

Survey of Education in Portugal. By M. H. HIGGINS and C. F. S. DE WINTON. London: Allen and Unwin. 1942. 75 pp. 3s. 6d.

This sketch of Portuguese education, shorn of five chapters by present restrictions, gives some idea of the organs and courses of the contemporary system, though it would need at least an equal volume to span the gulf between intent and effect. A first chapter on the Middle Ages and Renaissance might have made place for information about the nineteenth century which seems rather to be demanded by the remaining contents, almost entirely dealing with the present day.

The most obvious criticism to be levelled against Portuguese education is the amazing demand for memory work made by the series of official examinations, even the primary course requires an intimate knowledge of the names of the protuberances of the remoter Portuguese colonies and of the contents of the human body. At Coimbra the about-to-be-examined undergraduate paces the Jardim Botânico murmuring the words of his well-thumbed *sebenta* into the lower branches of the lime-trees. And those who were primed with a cram instruction in book-English rush straight into the exegesis of *The Fountain*. The Liceu, as the authors of the *Survey* would agree, is probably the most satisfactory stage from a didactic point of view. Its standardized text-books are handsomely presented. One might hope that the English institutions within whose sphere it falls would imitate the improvement of the official English course, so replete with errors and verbiage. The *Survey* examines secondary education fairly. Perhaps some information about the functions of the private 'explicador', about the methods of private schools other than the Colégio Militar and about school-fees might have been presented.

There are two chapters on Technical Education and one on the 'Classical Universities'—'classical' is hard to understand: two of the three dealt with date from 1910 and one has no faculty of letters. These chapters are quite succinct, but a little digression on the improvement of agricultural methods against the day when Portugal's population will be twelve million requires consideration of the resulting possibility that some half of that figure would be unemployed. Certain historical statements would I think need proof, and I cannot see why 'literary expression is the main aim of education'.

H. V. LIVERMORE

OXFORD

Die Amerbachkorrespondenz, im Auftrag der Kommission für die öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Alfred Hartmann. I. Band, *Die Briefe aus der Zeit Johann Amerbachs (1481-1513) mit Register und sechs Handschriftenproben*. Basel, Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek, 1942. xxiii + 488 pp. Fr. 35.

The enterprise of the Bâle University Press in publishing in war time a volume of this size and quality is praiseworthy. The thought that Dr Hartmann is now

engaged in preparing the companion volumes reminds one, somewhat painfully, of the irrelevancy of war-time preoccupations.

Series of letters written by individual Humanists to the Amerbachs of Bâle have been published previously. This is the first attempt to offer a complete, or practically complete, edition of the entire Amerbach correspondence in the possession of the University Library at Bâle, many thousands of letters written to, or by, the representatives of three generations of the family, Johannes, Bonifacius and Basilius. The present, first volume is given up to the letters written during the time of Johannes Amerbach, a printer who settled in Bâle about 1475. Many of them are purely business letters, one would have to have an expert's knowledge of early printing to read them with any enthusiasm. Many passages, however, have a wider appeal: a prolific dullard recommends his works to the publisher; the publisher, father of two sons studying in Paris, endeavours to get to the bottom of trouble between them and their tutor; his wife writes them pathetic letters, enjoining them to be good, learn, do as father tells them and to send their shirts regularly to the laundry.

About one in ten of these letters is written in German. The texts are diplomatic and would repay closer examination from the point of view of phonology and syntax. Dr Hartmann has dealt adequately with problems of lexicography, the only linguistic problems relevant to his task.

The editor's immense erudition and patience are evident from the commentaries and notes which accompany each letter. The most insignificant contemporary of Johannes Amerbach and the least promising title of book or tract referred to in the letters have been pursued and, generally, identified. Whilst we in no way wish to belittle the value of the first volume, it is evident that the later volumes will be of greater interest to literary historians.

F. P. PICKERING

MANCHESTER

Die Leiden des jungen Werthers. Edited by E. L. STAHL. (Blackwell's German Texts.) Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. xxxii + 169 pp. 6s.

Dr Stahl prints the text of the second version and justifies his preference for this over the original of 1774. Goethe's *Werther* is primarily a work of imaginative psychological fiction, not a veiled chapter of autobiography, and the additions and alterations of the second version are artistic improvements, giving breadth, depth and precision to certain chapters. The novelty of *Werther* lay in the presentation of a tragedy which was not caused by human malevolence but sprang direct from the despair of a frustrated soul. There was no effective treatment for Werther's malady but renunciation—a remedy which Goethe applies in all his later works but withholds in this. In Dr Stahl's words, 'For the last time, perhaps for the only time in his literary career, he gives free vent to a sense of tragic inevitability, of the possibility of which in life, however, he remained fully conscious. The depiction of tragic events of this kind was henceforward not given a prominent place in his literary work.' Dr Stahl places Goethe's personal relations to Kestner and Lotte Buff in their correct perspective and duly emphasizes the documentary value of Jerusalem's suicide by printing the full text of Kestner's letter to Goethe of 2 November 1772. The progressive disintegration of character in Jerusalem is unmistakably reproduced in *Werther*. Dr Stahl's notes explain the few obscure allusions in the text. In short, this is the handy edition of *Werther* for which university teachers have long been waiting. It is an essential volume of this enterprising series.

G. WATERHOUSE

BELFAST

The Heritage of Symbolism. By C. M. BOWRA. London: Macmillan. 1943. ix + 232 pp. 15s.

This is a collection of essays, both sensitive and stimulating, though the author declares that the 'book makes no claim to learning or to scholarship'. It is a contribution to international literature, dealing with a French, an Austrian, a German, a Russian, and an Irish 'symbolist'. As C. M. Bowra says, these writers do not belong to a special school, but are 'tinged with the characteristic colour of an epoch' (p. 1). Their works are indeed a challenge to standardization and proclaim a new faith in poetry as a supreme power over the human heart. These 'symbolists' only *seem* to stand aloof from life. They are really important spiritual forces in modern Europe. Rilke taught us that through grief Death transforms and completes our existence; George (like Hölderlin in 'Diotima') hailed in Maximin the embodiment of an ideal, Valéry reconciled intellect and body with bold candour; Blok sought a new creative vitality in the 'Spirit of Music', Yeats fought for an aristocratic nobility of mind. Thus these five poets rose above the limits of pure aestheticism, as represented for instance by Huysmans's 'À Rebours'.

The formidable genius of Rilke 'who seems to have no local roots' (p. 56) has already been the subject of important monographs. C. M. Bowra endeavours to show how Rilke's early work, which comprised on the whole 'impressions' and personal 'revelations', gradually gave way to poems of a more self-sufficient character, and how the poet finally found a true existence in the spiritual world alone. The author makes some most elucidating remarks on Rilke's creative appreciation of works of art: 'the further Rilke gets from a purely receptive state, the more striking his work is' (p. 62) (cf. also Rilke's 'Eva', 'Pietà', 'Orpheus Eurydike Hermes', etc.), and on the *Duino Elegies*, 'poems of nervous brooding'. Yet we cannot quite share the author's opinion that 'scholarship has unravelled' (p. 75) all difficulties as regards the *Elegies* (e.g. p. 79 or p. 93). It is a pity that C. M. Bowra touches so lightly on Rilke's prose and on the *Stundenbuch*, a turning-point in the poet's work. But the idea of Transformation stands out clearly.

Rilke differs from George as water from rock, and it is symptomatic that the author in his very approach to the two poets reacts intuitively to that difference. We cannot help feeling that he does not respond so happily to George. Perhaps in a sense the latter is still too near us—cf. his 'Brand des Tempels' or 'Widerchrist'. C. M. Bowra rightly stresses George's musical power of word, yet the reference to Mörike ('In even the best lyrics of Mörike or Lenau we feel that something is wanting, that they are not self-contained but wait for the musician to complete them. But George's songs sing themselves' (p. 115)) seems to us not altogether justified. Can one really speak of 'ordinary German verse' (p. 101) or 'the usual characteristics of German verse, its emphatic resonance and movement as to a military band' (p. 98)? Perhaps the author has poems such as Eichendorff's 'Wem Gott will rechte Gunst erweisen', etc. in mind; yet on the whole Goethe, Mörike, Heine, especially Hölderlin, Novalis and others hardly fit the above generalization. Likewise the triad *Geist—Seele—Leib* (p. 107) seems to us an ambiguous formula. Has Goethe only *Seele* and *Leib*, not *Geist*? (cf. p. 107. '*Geist* contains our appreciation of what is noble and tragic in life, the sense of destiny and of sacrifice'). The author gives a trenchant analysis of several poems. Speaking of George's 'Angel', he sees in it a symbol of George's own fuller self; Mallarmé and Rilke on the other hand see in *their* 'Angel' 'the absolute of inspiration' (p. 116).

The chapter on Valéry, actually the first in the book, is one of the best. Valéry was aware of the danger in Mallarmé's work: an inevitable severance from common existence through contemplative isolation, and a belief in music as 'the end of poetry' (p. 14). The author shows deep insight into Valéry's poetic inspiration. He analyses 'La Jeune Parque' as the turning-point in Valéry's work and one of 'the most obscure' (p. 21) modern monologues, calling for a comparison with

Mallarmé's 'Hérodiade'. C. M. Bowra is particularly convincing when dealing with the dualism between Valéry's conscious intellect and his trance-like state of mind. The antithesis presents no obstacle to the poet: on the contrary, it kindles his creative inspiration. The struggle is fought out in the torment of the flesh, cf. 'La Pythie' (pp. 39, 40), the drama 'of a virginal woman who finds herself invaded by an external power...', a symbol of an important spiritual process, the transformation into ordered speech of contending divine and human powers'. The body has its own poetry, cf. also Valéry's 'Ébauche d'un Serpent'.

Blok, like George and Yeats, points prophetically to a future of horrible bloodshed. But in contrast to George's demand for redemption through heroism, the Orthodox Christian Blok sees before him nothing but futile destruction: cf. the author's reference to 'A Voice from the Chorus' (p. 159 f.). Blok's 'Spirit of Music' is 'the exaltation of vitality which the artist finds in his inspiration' (p. 163). The author's sympathetic chapter on Blok's attitude to Russia and on the 'most important' poem 'The Twelve' (pp. 171 ff.) will make a special appeal to the reader at the present moment. In his final chapter on Yeats C. M. Bowra traces the poet's origin, background and character. He analyses some of Yeats's singular images: 'Townland' (p. 190), 'Rose' (p. 191), etc. The simplification of Yeats's style and a change in outlook (already prior to 1910) are illuminated by significant examples. The poet had become seer and politician.

The book, which despite present conditions of production is attractively printed, should make a wide appeal. The author's breadth of vision and critical insight are truly welcome. He has certainly succeeded in proving an unmistakable influence of symbolism on the works of these five outstanding poets, and at the same time shown how far they transcended their heritage.

AUGUST CLOSS

BRISTOL

SHORT NOTICES

The twenty-seventh volume of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, collected by Nowell Charles Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1942 for 1941. 75 pp. 7s. 6d.) is shorter than its predecessors, but equals them in interest and variety. Pride of place is given to Mr C. S. Lewis, whose essay on 'Psycho-Analysis and Literary Criticism' is a welcome exposure of certain fallacies in the application of the theories of Freud and Jung to the interpretation of literature. Mr Basil Willey brings out the blending of medieval and modern in 'Lord Herbert of Cherbury: a Spiritual Quixote of the Seventeenth Century'. Miss C. M. Maclean gives an interesting account of 'Lewesdon Hill and its Poet', rescuing William Crowe from undeserved oblivion. Dr R. W. Chapman, in 'A Problem in Editorial Method', brings his scholarship and experience to the consideration of the peculiar difficulties which beset editors of modern texts. Dr W. H. D. Rouse effectively illustrates his essay on 'Style' by recasting one of Jingle's anecdotes in the manner of Gibbon, Carlyle, Macaulay and Henry James. Lastly, Mr S. C. Roberts shows, by a survey of the 'fertile and varied output' of 1894, how much besides mere 'naughtiness' was 'At the Heart of the Nineties'.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS

LONDON

Dr Gellert Spencer Alleman's *Matrimonial Law and the Materials of Restoration Comedy* (Privately Published, Wallingford, Pa., U.S.A. vi+155 pp. \$2.00) is a book, by a student of literature, not a lawyer, to explain to the puzzled reader the legal aspects of Restoration comedy where the intrigue turns, as it so often does,

on marriage contracts, clandestine and irregular marriages and separation or divorce. The usual way is to take these things for granted and to say with Lord Campbell that the dramatists are not satisfactory expounders of the canon law, and without making an appeal to ignorance this seems a reasonable way. But the more serious student of Restoration and, for that matter, Jacobean comedy, who notices the place of the irregular marriage in these plays will want some guidance in the matter. He may want to know, for example, if the tricked or clandestine marriages in the plays are as binding in real life as the dramatists make them out to be. In how many Jacobean and Restoration stage marriages is a chambermaid foisted on the hero (or villain) as a rich heiress, and how often a mock priest who was to have performed the marriage ceremony turns out to be a real priest? Will these marriages stand in law? Mr Alleman is the perfect guide here, and if one has some time on hand, may prove a very pleasant guide too. Impressive tables are provided which show the author's exhaustive study both of drama and canon law.

GEORGE KITCHIN

EDINBURGH

Miss Dominica Legge has edited the chapters dealing with the luckless Balain (*Le Roman de Balain*, Manchester University Press, 1942. xxxii + 145 pp. 7s. 6d.) which lie dispersed in the vast *Huth-Merlin*. The edition has been carried through with the care we expect from Miss Legge, who has drawn for additional support on the Spanish *Baladro del sabro Merlin* and the Winchester manuscript of Malory. This serves to remind us that no accurate account exists of the Spanish edition of 1498. Though not likely to contain any new material, this edition is older than the accessible text and cannot be written off by criticism until it has been described. The primary object of Miss Legge's edition is 'to make the story of Balain accessible to the reader unfamiliar with the art of reading long cyclic romances' This 'art of reading' is the subject of Professor Vinaver's remarkably acute and stimulating introduction, which should be perused thoughtfully by all medieval scholars, whether they go on to *Balain* or not. It is not a *tour de force*, though the starting-point is given by some disparaging remarks by Gaston Paris on the story; but it is an attempt, mainly successful, to read the story through the eyes of a contemporary, while expressing the aesthetic effect by equivalent modern terms. Conversely, Professor Vinaver is able to show that other works which now enjoy universal esteem, were not in fact 'motivated' as we moderns too easily assume, but were more akin to *Balain* than we would have thought. In this novel within a novel the whole effect of the incidents 'depends on the constant presence and progress of an emotional theme—the theme of *mescheance*. The tale is that of a *chevaliers mescheans*, the most unhappy knight in the world, whose destiny is suggested with growing emphasis by each new turn of events.' Thus the hazy, cyclic Balain becomes a recognizable human shape: *mentem mortalia tangunt*.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

A short memorial of a recently deceased French master, Professor F. J. Tanqueray, has been contributed to the *Bulletin de l'Association des Étudiants Belges en Grande-Bretagne* (no. 6, automne 1942) by Professor Dechamps. Is it possible to hope for a brochure on Tanqueray's work? Devoted to his work, careless of applause, he never troubled to build his results into a creation that would serve as a memorial to himself. His articles are scattered far apart, but they are far more significant than the restrictions given by their titles, and their implications as to method and judgement might be very serviceable to students, if deduced and set forth by a sympathetic mind.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1943

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON

GENERAL

BOWRA, C. M., *The Heritage of Symbolism*. London, Macmillan. 15s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Spanish.

ALONSO, D., *La Poesía de San Juan de la Cruz*. Madrid, Instituto Antonio de Nebrija. 15 ptas.

PARKER, A. A., *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón*. London and Oxford, Dolphin Book Shop. 16s.

PEERS, E. A., *Spirit of Flame: a study of St John of the Cross*. London, Student Christian Movement Press. 6s.

Portuguese.

ROBERTS, K. S., *Orthography, Phonology and Word Study of the 'Leal Conselheiro'*. (Diss.) Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

RUSO, H. J., *Morphology and Syntax of the 'Leal Conselheiro'*. (Diss.) Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

French.

MILLER, J. R., *Boileau en France au dix-huitième siècle*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 33s. 6d.

SCHRADE, L., *Beethoven in France*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

BERREY, L. V., and M. VAN DEN BARK, *The American Thesaurus of Slang*. London, Constable. 40s.

English Institute Annual, 1941, ed. by R. Kirk. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s. 6d.

New English Dictionary, A, ed. by Sir James Murray, H. Bradley, Sir William Craigie and S. T. Onions. A Corrected Re-issue with an Introduction, Supplement and Bibliography. Oxford, Univ. Press. £21.

(b) *Modern English.*

ADAMS, J. C., *The Globe Playhouse*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press. \$5.00.

BARKER, A., *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma 1641-1660*. Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Press. \$3.75.

HARDY, E., *Donne: A Spirit in Conflict*. London, Constable. 10s. 6d.

HONE, J., *W. B. Yeats, 1865-1939*. London, Macmillan. 25s.

LAWRENCE, T. E., *Letters to H. S. Ede, 1927-1935*. Golden Cockerel Press. £2. 12s. 6d.

London in Flames, London in Glory. Poems on the Fire and Rebuilding of London 1666-1709, ed. by R. A. Aubin. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers Univ. Press. \$4.50.

MARTZ, L. L., *The Later Career of Tobias Smollett*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

- NARAYANA MENON, V. K., *The Development of William Butler Yeats*. With a Preface by Sir Herbert Grierson. London, Oliver and Boyd. 8s. 6d.
- Nineteenth Century Studies. A collection of essays on Coleridge, Byron, Carlyle, Browning, Ruskin, Morris, Butler, from the Department of English of Cornell University. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell Univ. Press. \$3.00.
- ODELL, G. C. D., *Annals of the New York Stage*. Vol. XIII [1885-1888]. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- PENROSE, B., *Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635*. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- Pleasant quippes for Upstart Newfangled Gentlewomen*, ed. by E. J. Howard. Oxford, Ohio, Anchor Press. \$1.25.
- ROBERTSON, J., *The Art of Letter Writing*. London, Hodder and Stoughton; Liverpool, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- SANDERS, C. R., *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement*. Studies in S. T. Coleridge, Dr Arnold of Rugby, J. C. Hare, Thomas Carlyle and F. D. Maurice. Durham, N. Carolina, Duke Univ. Press. \$3.50.
- SMITH, P. E., *Pathomachia, an Edition*. (Diss.) Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America Press.
- WORDSWORTH, D., and W. WORDSWORTH, *The Letters of*, ed. by E. de Selncourt. London, Oxford Univ. Press. £6. 6s.

THE SECOND ENGLISH SATIRIST

O, indignity
To my respectless free-bred poesy!¹

Before long Hall's famous arrogant invitation was accepted. John Marston brought forward his maiden literary venture, *The Metamorphosis of Pygmalions Image*. And (significantly enough) *Certain Satyres*.² Evidently he accepted Hall's priority, for he never challenged the claim; but certainly it must have irked one of Marston's peculiar nature to seem a follower in anything. He lost no time in showing his resentment, and throughout all his formal satires Hall was the individual most consistently attacked.

The quarrel itself is of small literary importance and deserves but brief attention. What is of more interest, however, is the literary relationship between these two satirists. For Marston, as we shall see presently, is more deeply indebted to Hall than to any other predecessor. And it is perhaps not unlikely, when we consider Marston's disposition, that one source of his rancour lies in this fact.

So far as it is possible to determine, Hall never answered the satiric assault directly. A friend of his, one 'W I.' (William Ingram?), attacked Marston effectively in *The Whipping of the Satire*. But Hall himself replied with a silent stinging satire: he failed to give public notice to Marston, and his *Virgidemiarum*, despite Marston's censure and rivalry, carried the day by its popularity. We have Marston's word for it:

But now this juggler, with the world's consent,
Hath half his soul; the other, compliment;
Mad world the whilst.³

In the tenth satire of *The Scourge of Villainy* Marston asserts that Hall caused an epigram 'to be pasted to the latter page of every *Pygmalion* that came to the stationers of Cambridge'. The epigram is a harmless bit of doggerel, far below Hall's satiric quality. Perhaps it was not he who wrote it, but a friend also interested in the quarrel.⁴ The fact remains, however, that Marston was of the opinion that Hall was the author, and his bitterness creates the impression that this epigram was in part, at least, responsible for some of the satire he launches at Hall.

Yet it must be remembered that Marston is apparently the initiator of the quarrel.⁵ He had written nothing before *Pygmalion*, and the last three books of Hall's satires were registered two whole months before this work of his rival.⁶ Excluding the possibility that Hall—in some passage of which we do not recognize

¹ *Scourge of Villainy* (to be referred to as *SV*.), vi, 99–100.

² Entered in the Stationers' Register, 27 May 1598.

³ *SV*, x, 63–5. All quotations are from Bullen's edition, *The Works of John Marston* (London, 1887).

⁴ R. M. Alden (*The Rise of English Satire*, Philadelphia, 1899, p. 145) and Konrad Schulze (*Die Satiren Halls*, Berlin, 1910, pp. 277–8) doubt Hall's authorship. Morse Allen (*The Satire of John Marston*, Columbus, Ohio, 1920, p. 15) suggests William Ingram as the possible author.

⁵ E. A. Beckwith, in his article, 'On the Hall-

Marston controversy', *J.E.G.P.* xxv (1926), 84–9, argues rather speciously to the contrary. He makes the point that Hall refers to 'Kin-sayder', a name which does not appear in print until the *Scourge of Villainy*. Therefore, if Hall attacked in epigram an 'item' (the name) not in print, it is 'plausible' that Hall attacked Marston before the latter had published! Beckwith, and Bullen, presume too much in setting their own standards of satiric morality. There is only one way to show Hall to be the initiator of the quarrel, and that is by finding positive references to Marston in Hall's satires.

⁶ Hall's on 30 March 1598, and Marston's on 27 May.

the significance—is attacking the manuscript *Pygmalion*, Marston sought the quarrel himself. It is significant that *Reactio*¹ contains no defence of *Pygmalion*, though we should certainly expect one if Hall had attacked the poem previously. But since Marston returns time and again to the offensive, we may be sure that the grievance was to him a real one. Perhaps he had already written some satires and was angered at Hall's having published first. But a more plausible reason seems to lie in the popularity of Hall's work. A man who thought as little of popular judgement as Marston was sure to find reason for bitter thoughts in a rival's success.

A clash in temperaments appears also to have contributed. Hall's self-complacency, and the calm confidence with which he assumed the censor's seat, were gall to Marston. And Marston was certainly no blushing modest author himself. Perhaps Marston, while struggling to attain the high confidence which the satirist's role seemed to require, was secretly a little envious of Hall, whom in some other respects he scorned. Indeed, one of Marston's rare bits of self-criticism was principally inspired by his eagerness to treat his rival's satiric demeanour sarcastically:

But since myself am not immaculate,
But many spots my mind doth vitiate,
I'll leave the white robe and the biting rhymes
Unto our modern satire's² sharpest lines.³

Himself the outspoken malcontent, he believed Hall to be a hypocrite, and this made his success all the more bitter:

O that this brother of hypocrisy
(Applauded by his pure fraternity)
Should thus be puffed, and so proud....⁴

But it is their literary rivalry which furnishes Marston with most of his ammunition. He pretends an excessive bewilderment over Hall's obscurity:

O darkness palpable! Egypt's black night!
My wit is stricken blind, hath lost his sight;
My shins are broke with groping for some sense,
To know to what his words have reference.⁵

He is in consistent disagreement with Hall's literary criticism. Allen even goes so far as to say that this disagreement is what may have inspired Marston to begin his career as satirist.⁶ This is perhaps an exaggeration, yet the close connexion between Elizabethan satire and literary criticism is certainly of significance.⁷ The fourth satire of Marston's *Pygmalion* group, entitled *Reactio*, is devoted entirely to answering the criticism in Hall's opening satires. One by one Marston defends the works that his rival had attacked,⁸ some by energetic ridicule of Hall, and others by carefully ordered, serious arguments.⁹ Parts of *Reactio* represent the youthful poet's *Ars Poetica*, and in his constructive zeal he sometimes forgets that

¹ Satire iv of the *Pygmalion* group (to be referred to as *S.*).

² Observe the indirect acknowledgment of Hall's priority.

³ *S.* II, 11-14.

⁴ *SV.* x, 39-41. For other references to Hall's hypocrisy see *S.* II, 6-10 and iv, 69 f.

⁵ *S.* II, 21-4. The passage continues to line 40.

⁶ *The Satire of John Marston*, p. 19.

⁷ Like Hall, Marston begins his satiric career with literary criticism; he attacks his own *Pygmalion*.

⁸ S. M. Salyer (*Joseph Hall as a Literary Figure*, unpublished Harvard thesis, 1921, pp. 82 ff.) is of the opinion that Marston deliberately misinterprets Hall.

⁹ As 47 ff. and 87 ff.

he is writing satire. He is the champion of poetry, crossing pens with the 'Athens' ape' who unappreciatively

and with his crooked eye
Presumes to squint on some fair poesy.¹

As a college man himself, Marston is gravely concerned:

it grieveth me
An academic should so senseless be.²

After he has attacked Hall's criticism, he proceeds to parody, with stinging effectiveness, Hall's overwritten *Defiance to Envy*:

But come, fond braggart, crown thy brows with bay,
Intrance thyself in thy sweet ecstasy:
Come, manumit thy plummy pinion,
And scour the sword of elvish champion:
Or else vouchsafe to breathe in wax-bound quill.
And deign our longing ears with music fill;
Or let us see thee some such stanzas frame,
That thou mayst raise thy vile inglorious name.³

Finally, in the last four lines of the satire, Marston makes a peace overture:

Eat not thy dam, but laugh and sport with me
At strangers' follies with a merry glee.
Let s not malign our kin. Then, satirist,
I do salute thee with an open fist.

He does not mean this seriously, however, for though he writes no more entire satires on Hall, throughout *The Scourge of Villainy* he continues the skirmishing. He attacks him on the literary front by ridiculing his choice of subjects,⁴ and he attacks him in a personal way by ridiculing his poverty while at Cambridge. Lollius's son

hath harder won
His true-got worship and his gentry's name
Than any swineherd's brat that lousy came
To luskish Athens and, with farming pots,
Compiling beds, and scouring greasy spots,
Hath got the farm of some gelt vicary,
And now, on cock-horse, gallops jollily.⁵

This sense of social superiority is an important part of Marston's attitude during the quarrel. He feels himself in sympathy with the young adventurer who 'gads to *Guiane* land to fish for gold',⁶ and he believes that the satirist who will 'nibble at a glorious action' such as this must be prompted by envy. The clearest expression of Marston's feelings on this point is made by Quadratus in *What You Will*:

Quake at the frowns of a ragged satirist—
A scrubbing railer, whose coarse, harden'd fortune,
Grating his hide, galling his starved ribs,
Sits howling at desert's more battle fate—
Who out of dungeon of his black despairs,
Scowls at the fortune of the fairer merit.⁷

¹ *SV*, ix, 25 f.

² *S*, iv, 71 f.

⁴ *SV*, iii, 111 ff.

³ *Ibid.* 131 ff. The parody continues to the end of the satire, with the exception of the final four lines. For an allusion, unnoted by Morse Allen, to Hall's 'boasted leap', see *SV*, xi, 132 ff.

⁵ *SV*, iii, 165 ff.

⁶ See Hall, *Virgideum*, iv, iii, 28 f., and Marston, *S*, iv, 109 ff.

⁷ ii, i, 146-51.

Yet underneath all the dust that Marston's satiric shots have raised there exists an intimate literary relationship. Marston has paid Hall, his rival, the bitter compliment of imitating him. A study of this imitation is profitable, for it throws light both upon Marston and Elizabethan satire in general.

We know from Marston's parody and his many gibes that he had read Hall carefully. From this reading he evidently brought away some ideas which later found expression in his own satires. Like Hall¹ he undertakes to write one satire to forestall criticism, and his first satire of the *Scourge* is to satisfy critics who think satire should be 'palpable dark' and 'rough writ'.² Marston also chooses, for an opening subject, satire on literature: his own *Pygmalion* and similar contemporary works. He takes Hall as his precedent and prefixes mottoes to his own satires, and in the early ones his mottoes are symbolic of the systematic thoroughness with which he is working, for, like Hall, at the outset he limits himself rather strictly to one subject at a time. In certain respects Marston's satiric attitudes remind one of Hall. He too is impressed with the glamour of his adventure.³ In theatrical fashion he calls on his Muse, 'Ingenuous Melancholy',⁴ that favourite of all Romanticists. He wishes his blood to forego its 'quick jocund skips' and run a 'sad-paced course', and in his plowing of Villainy's entrails he desires to be crowned by 'black cypress'. Thoughts of danger, needless to say, are rejected:

Hence, idle 'Cave', vengeance pricks me on,
When mart is made of fair religion.⁵

He dedicates *The Scourge of Villainy* to himself, and presents his verses to Detraction in much the same spirit which inspired Hall's *The Author's Charge to his Satires*.⁶

Of even more significance are the similarities in style and technique. Like Hall, Marston models his satiric manner after Juvenal's, but with an important difference. He appears to refer directly to Juvenal very seldom, and instead seems to have learnt much of his Juvenalian manner from Hall. Perhaps the most convincing test is to read the second satire of *The Scourge of Villainy*, for instance, beside one of the deliberately overwritten Juvenalian passages from Hall's biting satires. One can easily recognize something of the style of Juvenal; though it is exaggerated to the point of caricature in Marston, who, with deplorable enthusiasm, exaggerates Hall's exaggeration.

In affecting to reject popular contemporary themes,⁷ Marston is again depending on a precedent set by Hall,⁸ who modernizes Juvenal's renunciation of the stock themes of the literary era in which he lived. When Hall invents a variation by discarding minor subjects of satire for major,⁹ Marston again follows his predecessor, and with naive insolence he proceeds to reject Hall's themes as minor.¹⁰

In his use of satirical illustrations Marston apparently takes the worst of Hall's manner and further overworks it. His illustrations seldom have the spontaneous bite of Juvenal's, but rather display the artificial forced wit which is characteristic

¹ In the first of the biting satires, iv, i.

² See the prose preface, 'To those that seem judicial Perusers.'

³ See Hall's Prologue, Book i.

⁴ See *SV. Proemium in Labrum Primum*, 9 ff.

⁵ *SV. II*, 72 f.

⁶ Actually, this is not so much imitation of Hall as similarity in feeling. This spirit was in the air.

⁷ *SV. Proemium*, Lib. i, 3 ff. and *Proemium* Lib. ii, 13 ff.

⁸ *Virg. I*, i, 1 ff. Compare also Hall's refusal to practise the contemporary art of flattery (*Prologue*, Lib. i, 9 ff.) with Marston's echo of this sentiment (*SV. Proemium*, Lib. ii, 7 ff.).

⁹ *Virg. IV*, i, 88-91; *IV*, vii, 5-8.

¹⁰ *SV. III*, 111 ff.

of Hall's least successful attempts. An extreme example occurs in Marston's empty exercise, *Ad Rhythmum*, which introduces the second book of the *Scourge*:

Be not so fearful (pretty souls) to meet
As Flaccus is the sergeant's face to greet;
Be not so backward, loth to grace my sense,
As Drusus is to have intelligence
His dad's alive; but come into my head
As jocundly as (when his wife was dead)
Young Laelius to his home...¹

Why, one may well ask, should Marston, writing formal satire, refer to Hall rather than to the accepted masters, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal? The truth is, classical imitation has been taken too much for granted in Elizabethan satire. In Marston we find few actual parallels with the Roman satirists.² Yet, strangely enough, in the preface to *The Fawn*, published in 1606, the bulk of the quotations and allusions crammed into a few paragraphs very nearly equals that in all the formal satires put together. This makes it difficult for us to believe that the satirist Marston knew his Juvenal and Persius thoroughly and yet declined to borrow. Surely it would have been less damaging to his self-esteem and sense of independence, to his 'respectless free-bred poesy', to have borrowed from the dead inoffensive Romans than from his chief living rival. It is not that Marston is entirely averse to borrowing. Nearly one hundred unacknowledged lines of *The Fawn* have been traced to Florio's *Montaigne*.³ But Marston, in the preface to this play, endeavours to create the impression that his inspiration is classical: he quotes Martial, Juvenal, Persius, and calls Epictetus his bosom friend.

One can hardly think Marston so familiar with Latin satire as Hall.⁴ Had he been so well read we should probably have some of the fine assimilations that Hall delighted in. It is certainly difficult to believe that if Marston had known Juvenal while he was writing his *Scourge* he could have resisted borrowing some of the Roman's vast and juicy material on lust, and especially since in many places he is evidently straining for subject-matter. Nor can we think Marston familiar with Persius,⁵ though Grosart cites 'the cryptic obscurity of *Reactio*'⁶ as evidence of direct imitation. It should hardly be necessary to point out that Persius had no monopoly of literary obscurity. And yet this is the sort of criticism one hears time and again. It may well be that Marston, in his philosophical discourses,⁷ took Persius as a precedent: the earnestness and high tone in which he sometimes

¹ Lines 15-21.

² See Allen's *The Satire of John Marston*, p. 172, for a list. Additional parallels may also be noted: *S. i.* 1 f. and *Juv. iii.* 41 ff.; *S. ii.* 41-54 and *Mart. ii.* xv (note also *i.* xxix and *v.* xliii); *SV. i.* 26 and *Juv. ii.* 24-7; *SV. ii.* 76-9 and *Juv. xv.* 9-11 (a direct translation); *SV. In Lectores*, 71-80; *S. v.* 179-82 (for idea of being pleased as satires displease) and *Mart. vi.* 60; *SV. To...Perusers* (for lowest possible opinion of his verses and for remark on 'unpartial eye') and *Mart. xiii.* ii, 4 ff.

³ J. Sammont, *Influence de Montaigne sur Marston et Webster* (Louvain, 1914). Cf. Charles Crawford, 'Montaigne, Webster, and Marston: Donne and Webster', *Collectanea. Second Series* (Stratford-on-Avon, 1907). For Marston's borrowings from Seneca see J. W. Cunliffe, *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy* (New York, 1907) and F. L. Lucas, *Seneca and Elizabethan*

Tragedy (Cambridge University Press, 1922). In his plays Marston borrows freely, using phrases, *sententiae*, and even whole passages.

⁴ Marston repeats the typical second-hand criticism and calls Horace 'crabbed' (*SV. vi.* 96). Hall, who had first-hand acquaintance, calls him 'more smooth' than Juvenal or Persius (*v.* i, 10). Yet Marston is unquestionably learned: see Theodore Spencer, 'John Marston', *Criterion*, xiii (1934), 581-99. Furthermore, in attitude, if not always in practice, Marston, like Donne, is influenced by the rationalistic anti-classical opinion of imitation.

⁵ His chief indication of familiarity occurs in the preface to *The Fawn*, where, in a forced manner, he injects a couple of quotations from Persius i.

⁶ *Marston's Poems* (1879), p. lii.

⁷ See *SV. iv.* 153 ff. and the last 50 lines of *SV. viii.*

argues may be significant. But it is simply impossible to establish any definite relationship. An amusing sidelight on the influence of Persius is Marston's use of the character Labeo.¹ This Labeo is not the bad translator and poet to whom Persius alludes:² he is Hall's amorous poet.

Marston, though he plunged unhesitatingly, may well have had but a scanty first-hand acquaintance with classical satire. This whole problem is one which must be thrown in with Hall's lack of classical imitation in the first three books of the *Virgidemiarum*. Actually, these Roman satirists were hard. We have Thomas Drant's word for it that he could sooner translate twelve lines of Homer than six of Horace.³

But if the extent of direct classical influence on Marston is uncertain, the extent of indirect influence is more definite. His connexion with Hall, as we have seen, is in many respects close. He could not apologize, as Hall did,⁴ for the lack of an adequate contemporary model, and his echoing of some of Hall's ideas, satiric attitudes, and stylistic manner indicates that he made conscious use of this model.⁵ It is significant that Marston writes no *toothless* satires: he was relieved of the burden of discovering the kind of satire best suited for the age.

It must be admitted that the reader is not always pleased with the result of Hall's influence. Indeed, there is little doubt that some of the worst elements of Marston's satire derive from a classical or quasi-classical source. Too often, with the indiscriminate enthusiasm of a young author, he seizes on the worst in his model, and we have satirical illustrations and abrupt transitions employed *ad nauseam*. Sometimes he entirely mistakes the nature of what he is imitating, as, for example, Hall's use of literary and mythological allusions. This is intended as part of the intellectual content of Hall's satire, part of the accepted obscurity to which a learned style was entitled. But Marston, in cultivating obscurity, is obscure not only to the unlearned, who cannot follow his allusions; he is equally incomprehensible to those who understand his allusions but do not find that they lead anywhere.

Yet in spite of his model, Marston, like Hall, reveals much of the uncertainty of a young beginner. He too has independent experiments, and one can also detect the literary exercise. But if some of his faults may be traced to imitation of Hall, his merits are more clearly his own. And these, at least, are 'free-bred'.

ARNOLD STEIN

MINNEAPOLIS

¹ *The Author in praise of his precedent Poem (Pygmalion)*, 29 ff.

² Satire I, 4.

³ *Horace His arte of Poetrie, pastiles, and Satyrs Englished* (1567), 'To the Reader'.

⁴ *Postscript*.

⁵ Morse Allen (pp. 165-6) records some borrowings that are mostly of a verbal nature and

far from convincing. A similar list is compiled by A. Davenport, in 'Some notes on references to Joseph Hall in Marston's Satires', *Review of English Studies*, ix (1933), 192-6. Davenport does not mention Allen, but he offers many of the same words as evidence of borrowing; however, in neither case are there any really significant parallels suggested.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STOCK CHARACTER

II. THE STAGE SCOTSMAN; III. THE STAGE WELSHMAN (to 1800)

There is very little literature bearing on these, and most of it is hardly to the purpose. There are *A Scotsman's Remarks on the Farce called Love a la Moile* (1760) and F. J. Harries's *Shakespeare and the Scots* (1932). Harries also produced *Shakespeare and the Welsh* (1919) and *The Welsh Elizabethans* (1924). His books are not without interest, but they are scrappy and journalistic. Shakespeariana, like Richardson's essay on Fluellen (in *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters*, 1812) or A. E. Hughes's *Shakespeare and his Welsh Characters* (Shak. Assoc. 1918), are of little help. More useful, so far as they go, are two articles by W. J. Lawrence, on 'Welsh Song' and 'Welsh Portraiture' in Elizabethan drama (*T.L.S.* 9 Nov. and 7 Dec. 1922).

II. THE STAGE SCOTSMAN

For convenience, the stage Scotsman may be treated, like the stage Irishman, in three periods; but the first of these, 1589-1659, contains only about a dozen plays, of which more than half are either doubtful or very slight in their Scotticism. In the second period, 1660-1749, the characters are definitely Scots, but not particularly conventional, though, towards the end of the period, there are more signs of conventionality. In the third, 1750-1800, realism is often neglected, but the stock character only begins to reach the third stage¹ of his development; indeed, the conventional stage Scotsman did not actually become fully developed until after the popular dramatizations of the Waverley novels. About 69% of Scottish characters before 1800 are nationalized.

1589-1659. It is not possible to make any composite picture of the stage Scotsman of this period, for there are not enough recurring references to his national peculiarities. Perhaps the only significant one is to *blue bonnets*. The characters have very little general resemblance except in their speech, the realism of which consists of a few northern words and the indication of a few northern pronunciations. So far as it goes, however, the realism seems genuine enough in intention, and its slightness due to incomplete knowledge or ignorance. But in several plays it is doubtful how far the Scotticism is genuine, for, where this is not made clear, only northern English may have been intended. Scotland was really less accessible to London than Wales and Ireland, and the ultimate and horrible Highlands were unknown; yet to some extent it lacked the foreign interest which a greater difference of language gave these countries; nor did campaigning keep it in the English eye. With the accession of James I, and the influx of 'needy Scotch adventurers' that followed, it would have been natural to find an increased number of Scottish characters, but the king's objection to ridicule of the Scots was probably responsible for their almost complete absence during his reign. Under Charles I more appear, but not with much significance.

In *The Reign of King Edward III* (c. 1589), King David and Douglas show the faintest signs of Scotticism in their speech, and there is also a Scottish messenger with the typical name of Jemmy. After the first act of Greene's *Scottish History of James IV* (c. 1591) dialect practically disappears; but in it the dialect which Sir Bartram and Bohan (i.e. Buchan) use contains no obvious errors. Certain expressions, such as *gar*, *threap*, *ais dab this whinyard in thy wemb*, *haud your clacks*,

¹ The three stages were discussed in the previous article on the stage Irishman, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxvii (1942), pp. 438-9

are genuinely Scottish. Bohan, a Scots gentleman, disillusioned at court and in domestic life, in order to explain his hatred of the world to the fairy Oberon, presents this play about 'a king, over-ruled with parasites; misled by lust...in action' by guid fallows of our countrymen'. He and Oberon act as Induction and Chorus.

Shakespeare's Captain Jamy (*Henry V*, 1599) is rather taciturn and canny, compared with Macmorris and Fluellen, but although in this way he bears some resemblance to the conventional Scot of more recent years, he is an isolated case, and there is no further indication that these qualities were meant for Scottish Northern, a clothier, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), speaks in a way which, if not Scottish, is near to it. In the same play there is one Haggise,¹ who may be a Scot, but does not show it. Captain Jamy and Northern show differences from English in pronunciation only.

There is one speech in *Thierry and Theodoret* (1617) by Fletcher and Massinger, in which a soldier imitates a beggar. He uses the words *bonny*, *blithe*, and *mickle*, and makes *to a sucker womb* mean 'to such a belly', so he is obviously intended to be mimicking a Scot. Constance, the heroine of Brome's *Northern Lass* (1632), uses a dialect which is a matter of words and pronunciations rather than phrases. There is nothing peculiarly Scottish about her character. At one place in Sampson's *Vow-Breaker* (1633) some northern and other dialect words occur, when certain characters seem to pretend to be Scottish, but it is very difficult to see why. They are inaccurate in any case, for *gar* is made to mean 'go', and *lurden*, apparently, 'lover'.

Jonson's *New World in the Moon* (1620) contains a few Scottish references, presumably to please the king, and the word *baubee* is used: in his *Love's Welcome at Welbeck* (1633), Fitzale, introducing Tawny-Hood, one of the masquers, says, 'Then Tawny fra' the kirk that came'. A song in Act v of Fisher's *Fuimus Troes* (1633) contains many seemingly northern words and some dialect words not specifically northern, on investigation, however, it appears that out of some thirty such words about twenty-five are derived from Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*. Randolph's *Hey for Honesty* (pr. 1651)² contains a beggar from each of the four nations. The speech of Brun, the Scot, is not consistent: *bellibarne* seems to imitate Spenser's *bellibone* (*bonny Bels* occurs in *The Vow-Breaker*); *gar* means both 'do' and 'go', and *aies* *wos gang* 'I will go'. *Sow-baby* (sucking-pig) and *rasher* (a blow), though dialect, are not northern; but *aies no meddle* rings true.

William Wallace is the hero of *The Valiant Scot* (1635) by J.W. (Gent.), most of which is in blank verse. Peggy, Wallace's wife, speaks Scots even in her verse speeches; Wallace 'only when he is in disguise as a crippled soldier. Only here, and in Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, do I find the present participle in *-and* used. This, as well as the whole atmosphere of the play, suggests that J.W. may have been a Scottish 'Gent'. One passage, spoken by Peggy when she and Wallace are prisoners, is perhaps worth quoting:

Dear Wallace, thoe ane shrude
Hawd not our bands,³ wees meet in yander cloud
Where na fell Southern nowther can extrude
Nor bar us fra celestiaall pulchritude,
Aid gang thy gate, till heaven, and as we flay
Like turtle Dowes weese bill and find gude play.

¹ The haggis was not peculiar to Scotland before the eighteenth century. But Haggise's fellow-watchman, Bristle, is certainly Welsh.

² The dialect parts may have been added after Randolph's death in 1635.

³ *sic*. Probably for *hames*.

In Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* (pr. 1641) Lorel, Douce, and Maudlin use dialect, but none of them quite consistently, Scathlock, a huntsman, uses it a little, but not his brother Scarlet. Here the whole intention of the use of dialect is pastoral-artificial. Though many northern forms occur, the dialect cannot ever be written down as certainly meant for Scottish, or, indeed, always for northern.

John Tatham, who had no love for the Scots, presented them in three plays, of which two may be mentioned here: *The Distracted State* (pr. 1641), with an apothecary, and *The Scotch Figgaries* (pr. 1652), with two beggars, a soldier, and a court fool. Tatham's dialect is perhaps not so utterly unlike Scots speech as his editors (Maidment and Logan, 1879) assert, but it is mainly a matter of suggesting Scots pronunciation and sprinkling Scots words more or less at haphazard.

Taking the language in these plays as a whole, the spelling seems to try to represent certain easily noticeable differences between English and Scottish pronunciation. *The Valiant Scot* is the only play which contains anything really like the 'Scottis Tong', as, say, King James used it in his *Reulis and Cautelis*. These differences are expressed in spellings like *guid*, *gud*, *gude*, *gewd*, *grod*; *mear*, *macr*, *mare*, *mere*; *whayle* and *paiper* stand for 'while' and 'piper', *hauf* for 'half'; *hawd* for 'hold', *tull* and *toll* for 'till'. There are also *eance*, *lard*, *nething*, *grund* for 'ground', *wud* or *wad* for 'would', *durblet* and *kuintry*. None of these spellings are consistent.

The most noticeable and regularly used Scottish words are: *bonny*, *gang*, *mickle* and *muckle*, *gar*, *crag* for 'neck', *sic*, *wame* for 'belly', *till* for 'to', *deil*, *whinyard* for 'sword', and *Ise* for 'I will'. The oath *bread a God* occurs more than once. All are variously spelt.

There is a slight realism evident in this period, and there is no conventionality worth speaking of. In *Henry V*, *Thierry and Theodoret*, and *Hey for Honesty*, there seems to have been some attempt to make the Scot typical of his nation, as in these plays he is brought on the stage in parallel with characters of other nationalities. Tatham also attempted to make his Scotsmen representative: this they are not, for his effort was only to present them as typical in the evil qualities which his dislike projected upon them. In none of these cases do we get the same sense of conformity to a presentation acceptable to the audience as we contemporaneously get, slightly with the stage Irishman and strongly with the stage Welshman. None of them seem to have influenced the figure of the later stage Scotsman to any extent. In the other plays there is no attempt to typify. As a whole, this period is a preliminary to the first stage of the stock character's development.

1660-1749. In five¹ plays the tone is such that, if the Scottish characters had been Irish, they would have shown a distinct conventional nationalism: as it is, they show only slight signs of it. One always tends to take Scottish characters for more conventional than they really are, by a sort of analogy with the Irish, especially when Irish and Scottish characters are parallel in the same play. Other plays, which are interesting for their realism and good dialect, stand apart from the convention, and, except *The Gentle Shepherd*, were unacted.² A fashion which made Scottish songs popular³ in the later years of the seventeenth century accounts for the fact that, out of the sixteen plays on my list between 1660 and 1700, seven

¹ *Sauntythe Scot*; *Courtship a-la-Mode*; *Humours of the Army*; *The Wonder*; and *Love in All Shapes*. The servants, and Colonel Hyland, show a certain brusque independence. In *Love in All Shapes*, there are signs of a conventional attitude towards Scotsmen.

² *The Assembly*; *Ireland Preserved*; *The Earl of Mar Marr'd*; *The Gentle Shepherd*; and *The Restoration of King Charles II.*

³ Cf. Chappell's *Popular Music of the Olden Time*, pp. 459-60, 490, 610 note, etc.

contain only a Scottish song or snatch of song, sung by a non-Scottish character.¹ Five of these are by D'Urfey, and in one of the others the song is his.

Tatham's *The Rump* (pr. 1660) contains 'Wariston, a Scotch Laird, President of the Committee'. A *Short Representation* was performed before General Monk at Goldsmiths' Hall, 11 April 1660. In it a Scotsman expresses his gratitude to the General. *Sauny the Scot* (1667),² adapted from *The Taming of The Shrew* by the comedian John Lacy, takes its name from Petruchio's servant, a coarse, but vigorous and amusing character. Though his nationality is emphasized, and his dialect rather good, he is conventional as a servant rather than as a Scot.

In D'Urfey's *Sir Barnaby Whigg* (1681) Swift pretends to be a Scottish priest, but only one speech has any dialect. Mrs Behn's *The Roundheads* (1681), an improvement of *The Rump*, alters Wariston but little. In her *City Heiress* (1682) Constance pretends to be a Scotswoman, and in her *Widow Ranter* (1689) there is a bagpiper (non-speaking) and a Scottish dance. The Countess in Ravenscroft's *Dame Dobson* (1684) pretends to be Scottish.

Dr Archibald Pitcairne's *The Assembly* (c. 1692) is a clever and savage satire on the Scots kirk, written with vigour and realism. Though it has many dialect-speaking characters, there is absolutely no conventionality in the characterization. It was, of course, written for Scotsmen.

Wilhe, the footman in Craufurd's *Courtship a-la-Mode* (1700), is rather like Sauny, but not so broadly portrayed.

Michelburne's *Ireland Preserved* (1705) contains several Scots-speaking characters, most if not all of whom are 'Ulster Scots'; but he does not appear to distinguish their speech from that of the Scots of Scotland. There are many realistic dialect-speaking characters in *The Earl of Mar Marr'd* (1715) by John Philips; but, although Highland and Lowland characters are distinguished, their modes of speech are not

* Colonel Hyland, in Shadwell's *Humours of the Army* (1713), is parallel to an Irishman and a Welshman, and conventional in conception, if not in fact. In Mrs Centlivre's *The Wonder* (1715), Gibby, the footman, wears a 'Highland Dress'.³ Less coarse and farcical than either of the other footmen, like them he is genuinely amusing.

As Allan Ramsay's *Gentle Shepherd* (1725) was written for Scotland, not for England, there was no exotic interest in its display of nationality. It was not acted publicly until 1747 (in Edinburgh), and not in London till 1754, where its full and idiomatic Scots presented the audience with many difficulties. It was several times adapted and translated, but affected the stock character only indirectly.

In *The Modern Poetasters* (1725), by 'Isaac Bickerstaff, jun.', Sauny, 'a Scotch poet come to London', wears a Scottish dress³ and uses a little dialect. Such characters were more frequent after 1750. In turning *Dame Dobson* into *The Female Fortune Teller* (1726), Charles Johnson altered the Scottish part only a little. The satiric *Restoration of King Charles II* (1732), by Walter Aston, has good dialect and interesting songs, but hardly touches the stock figure. Colonel Goatish,

¹ Wilson's *Projectors* (1665); D'Urfey's *Fond Husband* (1667), *Trick for Trick* (1678), *A Vicious Wife* (1679), *A Fool's Preferment* (1688), and *The Campaigners* (1698). Scott's *Mock Marriage* (1696) uses one of D'Urfey's songs.

² This play may have been acted earlier. Vide Evelyn's *Diary* for 3 October 1662.

³ This was probably a blue bonnet and kilt, in which dress the Scot is shown on many broadsheets. But the frontispiece of the 1735 edition of *The Scotch Figgaries* shows the Scots wearing what look like tartan 'trews'. Cf. the introduction to Maidment and Logan's edition.

an 'old whoremonger' in *The Jew Decoyed* (1735), is quite an amusing and vivid picture of a 'dirty old man', but his nationality and dialect are incidental.

Cheviot, 'the Scotch chafferer' in *Love in All Shapes* (1739), finds that 'naught agrees sae well with a Scotch stomach, as an English fortune'. In *Court and Country* (1743) one speech reports, with mimicry, what a Scotsman had said.

Certain Scottish characters show a coarseness of speech and manners:¹ Scotsmen wear blue caps,² they have bagpipes;³ their religion is Presbyterian.⁴ the Scots pound is of small value.⁵

Pepys complained that, because he could not understand the language, *Sauny the Scot* lost half its life for him.⁶ Yet the peculiarly Scottish words in it are not very many; and they are fewer in the other plays of the same group,⁷ all of which seem to rely on a few of the more familiar words and more noticeable pronunciations. This is no doubt because these plays are usually 'theatre', and cannot afford to strain their audiences overmuch.

The other group,⁸ especially, of course, *The Gentle Shepherd*, is much more realistic in language, and could not have been anything but unintelligible to Londoners. It uses many more Scots words and indicates many more differences of pronunciation, including, however, those on which the first group relies. In these there is considerable agreement: the words and pronunciations most noticeable in this period are practically the same as those most noticeable in the first, but they are more consistently spelt.

The seed of a stock Scots character has now been sown, but the germ has only just begun to grow. Though there is more knowledge of the Scots than before, it is still not very great, and what conventionality the stage Scotsman shows is more in the writers' attitude than in the characters, and is to some extent reflected from the more conventionally advanced stage Irishman.

1750-1800. The division is made at 1750, not at 1760 as in the case of the stage Irishman, because, in so far as a stock Scotsman does develop before 1800, he begins to do so in Smollett's *Reprisal* (1752), Foote's *Englishman Returned from Paris* (1756), and Macklin's *Love à la Mode* (1759). The Scots in these plays are more akin to those which follow them than to those which precede them. During the decade 1750-60, Bute established himself as a court favourite, and, as a patron of literature, favoured Scotsmen. It was at this time that Scots began to throng to London to seek their fortunes, and became pretty generally unpopular there in the process.⁹

During this period the number of nationalized characters doubles, and a stock character begins to crystallize out. The composite picture which can be built up, though less conventional than that of the contemporary Irishman, does show a certain conventionality. The Scot is inclined to arrogance. He has come to London

¹ E.g. in *Sauny the Scot*, *Courtship a-la-Mode*, and *The Jew Decoyed*. Cf. also Butler's character of *A Ribald*, and *Scotland Characterized* (1701).

² Cf. Edward Howard's *Man of Newmarket* (1678), iv, 1; 2 *Ireland Preserved*, iii, xvi; *Earl of Mar* Marr'd, i, ii; *The Gentle Shepherd*.

³ Cf. *Sauny the Scot*, iii, 1, *Widow Ranter*, ii, ii; *Humours of the Army*, v, Philip's *Pretender's Fate* (1716), i, iii.

⁴ Cf. Porter's *Witty Combat* (1663), i, 1; *Man of Newmarket*, iv, 1; *The Roundheads*, *The Assembly*; *Courtship a-la-Mode*, iii, 1, 1 *Ireland Preserved*, v, vi; *The Wonder*, iii; *Earl of Mar*

Marr'd, i, i; *Restoration of Charles II*; *Love in All Shapes*, i.

⁵ Cf. *Sauny the Scot*, ii; *Restoration of Charles II*, i, iii.

⁶ *Diary*, 9 April 1667. It is worth note that Pepys, who enjoyed Lacy's acting, makes no such qualification in praising his Teague (12 June 1663).

⁷ Vide note 1, p. 281 above.

⁸ Vide note 2, p. 281 above.

⁹ Cf. *inter alia* Boswell's *Life of Johnson* and Graham's *Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century* (1909).

to make his fortune. He may try his luck as an author,¹ or a tutor² (for which his erudition,³ usually acquired at a Scottish University,⁴ qualifies him). He thinks himself a good speaker,⁵ and is even prepared to teach elocution to the English;⁶ but in addition to his native accent, he has a trick of slow and deliberate speech.⁷ His musical instrument is the bagpipes.⁸ He is mean, but his meanness is 'Scottish oeconomy'.⁹

Of the plays which do not directly affect the stock character, four are worth notice. Ward's *Billet Master* (1787) comments on the need for a translation of *The Gentle Shepherd*,¹⁰ in this the Cook sings a song 'learned from a Highland drover' in which Highland speech is shown. *Jamie and Bess* (1787), a Scots pastoral in imitation of *The Gentle Shepherd*, by Andrew Shirrefs, is a pleasant poem in genuine Scots. Archibald M'Laren played a Highland boatman in his own *Humours of Greenock Fair* (c. 1788), using a distinctive dialect, with snatches of Gaelic. His *Highland Drover, or Domhnall Dubh M'Na Beunn* (1790), contains two drovers, who speak nothing but Gaelic. He played the title-part. Betty, who knows some Gaelic, interprets between the Highlanders and the English-speaking characters. A translation is printed after each Gaelic speech. The Highlanders in this lively and amusing farce are very like some of the characters in *Kidnapped*. Both these plays were acted in Scotland.

In the plays which contribute directly to the stage Scotsman, the language varies in elaboration and care, but its representation in print is usually based on the few noticeable differences mentioned above. As with Irish characters of the period, there is an evident tendency to leave the dialect to the actor, but this tendency is not so marked in the case of the Scots. It is worth noting that no peculiarity in the pronunciation of *r* is ever indicated.

English knowledge of the Scots, for various reasons, was later than English knowledge of the Irish and Welsh, for dramatic purposes at least. Because of this, the stage Scotsman is later in developing. He does not reach full development in the period under review, during which he is in transition between the second and the earlier part of the third stage of a stock character's development.

III. THE STAGE WELSHMAN

The stage Welshman is in a different position from the other two. He seems to spring upon the stage nearly full-fledged, which points to the previous existence

¹ Cf. Reed's *Register Office* (1761); Colman the elder's *Occasional Prelude* (1772); Jodrell's *Widow and No Widow* (1779), M'Nally's *Critic upon Critic* (1788); Holcroft's *German Hotel* (1790).

² Cf. Foote's *Englishman Returned from Paris*, and *Devil upon Two Sticks* (1768), M'Nally's *Fashionable Levities* (1785); *German Hotel*.

³ Cf. *Reprisal*; *Register Office*, *Devil upon Two Sticks*, Stevens's *Trip to Portsmouth* (1773); Pilon's *Siege of Gibraltar* (1780); Lady Craven's *Minutiae Picture* (1781); Macklin's *Man of the World* (1781); *Fashionable Levities*; *Critic upon Critic*; Ryssle's *Roderick's Random* (1789); *German Hotel*.

⁴ Cf. *Devil upon Two Sticks*; Colman the elder's *Spleen* (1776); Stewart's *Students* (1779); *Fashionable Levities*; *Critic upon Critic*. During this period the Scottish Universities emerged from their academic darkness.

⁵ Cf. Murphy's *Apprentice* (1756); *Register*

Office; Foote's *Orators* (1762), Pilon's *Humours of an Election* (1780).

⁶ Cf. *Humours of an Election*, also Smollett's *Humphrey Clinker*.

⁷ Cf. *Occasional Prelude*; *Widow and No Widow*; Jodrell's *Musico* (1787); also *A Scotsman's Remarks on Love à la Mode* and Sullivan's recitation *The Test of Union and Loyalty* (1797).

⁸ Cf. *Reprisal*; Cumberland's *Fashionable Lover* (1772); Arnold's *Auld Robin Gray* (1794); Benson's *Love and Money* (1795).

⁹ Cf. *Fashionable Lover*; *Trip to Portsmouth*; *Siege of Gibraltar*; *Minutiae Picture*; *Man of the World*; Davies's *Man of Honour* (1786). Apparently the stock attribution of meanness to the Scots owes something to their political philosophers.

¹⁰ Ward had published such a translation in 1785.

of a generalized notion of a Welshman in English minds.¹ This is not unnatural. Wales was more mutually accessible with London than Ireland or Scotland, and its political connexion with England was closer. Like the Irish, its people differed from the English in race and language, but were in closer contact with them. Their peculiarities were therefore almost as striking as those of the Irish, but more was generally known about them in England. There were more Welshmen about London than Irish or Scots, and W. J. Lawrence seems to have justification when he suggests that some Welsh would have been understood by an Elizabethan theatre audience. These things all made possible a pre-dramatic realistic base for the stock character. The stage Welshman develops little after 1620, the peak of his popularity. Before then he was well into the third stage of development, though he never reached quite such completeness as the Irishman and Scotsman ultimately did. He cannot, therefore, be treated in quite the same way. He may be taken, for convenience, in the same three periods as the stage Irishman—1592–1659, 1660–1759, 1760–1800—but the last two are periods of declining popularity. Indeed, this decline had begun to set in even before the accession of Charles I. The stage Welshman did, of course, change to a slight extent in the later periods, but not in the degree of his conventionality, time inevitably affected him, and so did the analogy of the other stock characters; such changes, however, are of little significance. About 74% of Welsh characters before 1800 are nationalized.

1592–1659 There is more variety among Welsh characters than among Irish, and they are not so easily classified, but they are conventional earlier, and the typical references, in this case more frequent, are more regularly and consistently stressed.

In *A Merry Knack to Know a Knav* (1592), Honesty pretends to be a Welsh gull, to the discomfiture of Cuthbert the coneycatcher. Will Summer, in *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (1592), by Thomas Nashe, imitates a Welshman describing his visit to London. Rice ap Howell, in Marlowe's *Edward II* (c. 1592), carries a 'Welsh hook', but is not otherwise nationalized. A Welsh song (not printed) was sung in Act II, Sc. i of Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (c. 1594). Of Shakespeare's Welsh characters, the Captain in *Richard III* (1594) is not nationalized, while Owen Glendower, in 1 *Henry IV* (1597), has little relation to the stage Welshman, as his qualities, though to some extent national, are not conventional. Unfortunately, the conversation in Welsh which he had with Lady Mortimer, and her Welsh song, have not been preserved. Shakespeare knew much more of the Welsh than he did of the Irish or Scots, and Fluellen in *Henry V* (1599) is vastly superior in characterization to Jamy and Macmorris. He and Sir Hugh Evans in *The Merry Wives* (1602) are both individualized, not merely farcical characters; but both are conventional at several points. So are the two followers of Lord Powis, Davy and Owen, in *Sir John Oldcastle* (1600).

Dekker's *Patient Grissill* (1600) has three Welsh characters. The servant, Rice, is not nationalized; but Sir Owen ap Meredith and Gwenthyran, the widow he marries, have large parts in which they not only use a marked dialect, but also make whole speeches in Welsh. In Dekker and Marston's *Satiromastix* (1601), Sir Rees ap Vaughan has little national quality, but exhibits Welsh pronunciation in his later scenes. Heywood's *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject* (1602?) contains a thoroughly conventional Welshman 'new come to London'. Captain Jinkins, in Dekker and Webster's *Northward Ho* (1604), is likewise conventional. Nucome, a courtier, in *Cupid's Whirligig* (1607), does not use dialect, but jokes are made about his nationality. The clown in Arnim's *Two Maids of Moreclacke*

¹ Cf. the previous article on the stage Irishman.

(c. 1607) acts the Welshman in a short scene. Sir Hugh, 'a prince of Wales', is the hero of Rowley's *A Shoemaker a Gentleman* (1608). Some play is made with his nationality.

In *The Valiant Welshman* (c. 1610) by R.A. (Gent.), of which Caradoc is the hero, there is one conventionalized character, Morgan, Earl of Anglesey. No one else, not even the rustics, uses dialect. The 'Bardh, or Welsh poet' acts as chorus. Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside* (1612) contains a Welshwoman who speaks a few words in Welsh. Slight but definite references are all that show the nationality of Bristle, a watchman in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* (1614). A soldier has one speech in imitation of a Welsh beggar in Fletcher and Massinger's *Thierry and Theodoret* (1617).

Jonson's antimasque *For the Honour of Wales* (1619) has seven speaking parts, all using conventional speech and references, and Welsh phrases. In 1621 a Welsh madman is found in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Pilgrim* and another in Middleton's *Changeling*. Penda and Eldred, who pretend to be a Welsh ambassador and his servant, take up a great part of *The Welsh Ambassador* (c. 1623). They are highly conventional, as is also Jenkin, in Shirley's *Love Tricks* (1624). Randall, a Welshman come to London, has a large part in Rowley's *Match at Midnight* (1633), and is a very amusing, well-developed stage Welshman. Caradoc, a beggar in Randolph's *Hey for Honesty* (pr. 1651), is also conventional.

A Welshman's weapon was a 'Welsh hook',¹ and his musical instrument a harp;² he kept goats³ and wore frieze;⁴ he often referred to Saint David⁵ and Cadwallader,⁶ and was inclined to break into his own language.⁷ He loved cheese,⁸ especially toasted, when he called it 'cawse boby', his national emblem was the leek,⁹ which, as well as onions, he liked to eat. Metheglin⁹ was his favourite drink, but he also liked perry¹⁰ and whey.¹¹ He was very proud of his pedigree, and always considered himself a gentleman.¹² He continually addressed and referred to Welshmen, and sometimes others, as 'cousin'.¹³ He asserted that the Welsh were descended from the Trojans, or the Greeks.¹⁴ His name contained *ap*, and was long.¹⁵ He was inclined to theft.¹⁶ When he went up to London, he was specially interested

¹ Cf. *Edward II*, iv, 1; *Henry IV*, ii, iv; *Sir John Oldcastle*, i, 1; *Northward Ho*, ii, 1; *For the Honour of Wales*; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1084, 1100, 1542, 1999; *Love Tricks*, ii, 1.

² Cf. *Northward Ho*, ii, 1; *Shoemaker a Gentleman*, iii; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1084, 1416, 2002; *Love Tricks*, ii, 2; *Match at Midnight*, i, 1, iv, 1; *Hey for Honesty*, v, 1.

³ Cf. *Henry V*, v, 1; *Merry Wives*, v, iv; *Northward Ho*, ii, 1; *Pilgrim*, v, iii; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1096, 1542, 1998.

⁴ Cf. *Northward Ho*, ii, 1; *For the Honour of Wales*; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1542; Glapthorne's *Hollander* (1635), ii, 1.

⁵ Cf. *Patient Grissill*, ii, 1; *Northward Ho*, iv, 1; *Valiant Welshman*, i, 1; *For the Honour of Wales*; *Thierry and Theodoret*, v, 1; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1533; *Match at Midnight*, i, 1; ii, 1; iii, 1; *Hey for Honesty*, iii, 1.

⁶ Cf. *Henry V*, v, 1; *Northward Ho*, iv, 1; *Match at Midnight*, iv, 1.

⁷ In half the plays.

⁸ This reference occurs in two-thirds of the plays, and often elsewhere.

⁹ These references occur in more than half the plays, and often elsewhere.

¹⁰ Cf. *Valiant Welshman*, iv, 1; *For the Honour of Wales*; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1525; also Shirley's *Upon the Prince's Birth* (1630).

¹¹ Cf. *Northward Ho*, ii, 1; *Pilgrim*, iv, iii; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1522, 1542.

¹² This reference occurs in more than two-thirds of the plays, and very often elsewhere.

¹³ Cf. *Sir John Oldcastle*, i, 1; *Patient Grissill*, ii, 1; iii, 1; iv, 1; *Cupid's Whirligig*, iii, 1; *Shoemaker a Gentleman*, iii; *Valiant Welshman*, iv, iii; *Thierry and Theodoret*, v, 1; *For the Honour of Wales*; *Match at Midnight*, i, 1; *Hey for Honesty*, iii, 1 and ii.

¹⁴ Cf. *Northward Ho*, iv, 1; *Valiant Welshman*, iv, iii; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1174; *Match at Midnight*, i, 1; *Hey for Honesty*, iii, 1 and ii.

¹⁵ Cf. *Sir John Oldcastle*, i, 1; *Royal King and Loyal Subject*, i, 1; Marston's *What You Will* (1607), iii, iii; *Shoemaker a Gentleman*, iii; Tomkin's *Albumazar* (1614), iii, ix; *Welsh Ambassador*, 1128, 1964; Mountfort's *Launching of the Mary* (1632), Mal. Soc. ed. p. 50; *Match at Midnight*, iv, 1; *Hey for Honesty*, iii, 1.

¹⁶ Cf. Marston's *Malcontent*, i, vii; *Cupid's Whirligig*, i, 1; *Valiant Welshman*, iii, ii; *Match at Midnight*, i, 1.

in St Paul's,¹ and often compared the organ there with the one at Wrexham,² of which he was very proud. Welshmen went to Jesus College at Oxford.³ They were sometimes carriers.⁴

The pronunciation of the Welsh characters has more peculiarities indicated, and those more consistently, than that of the others, presumably because Welsh pronunciation was more familiar. $p=b$ is nearly always shown, $t=d$, $g=k$, s , sh , or $ch=j$, s or $sh=ch$, and the omission of initial w before o , are very frequent; $c=g$, $s=sh$, $f=v$, and $d=t$ are common. *Her* or *hur* is very frequently used for any personal pronoun, and so are plural for singular nouns. Common expressions are: *hark you*, *mark you*, *look you*, *out of cry*, *diggon*,⁵ *comraque*,⁵ *tawson*.⁵ *Cot's splutter a nails*, common later, first occurs in *Hey for Honesty*.

1660-1759. The stage Welshman had begun to decline in popularity before the closing of the theatres, and continued to do so after their reopening. He is now more narrowly conventional than before, with fewer typical references and fewer peculiarities of speech. Several characters seem to owe their existence to the earlier plays from which they are derived.

There is a conventional Welshman in *A Short Representation before General Monk* (1660). Scapin imitates a Welshman in Otway's *Cheats of Scapin* (1676). 'A young Welsh jilt' called Winifred, who follows the mode, occurs in D'Urfey's *Sir Barnaby Whigg* (1681). Jinkin, in Ravenscroft's *Dame Dobson* (1683), is rather more elaborate than most of the characters of this time. Rice ap Shinkin, 'a young whimsical Welsh fop' in D'Urfey's *Richmond Heiress* (1693), speaks dialect and sings a Welsh song to the harp. Sir Morgan Blunder, in Mrs Behn's *Younger Brother* (1696), is described as a 'person of quality in Wales', but nothing more to the purpose.

Vanbrugh's alteration (1700) of *The Pilgrim* only makes the Welsh madman's part more consistent in spelling. Dennis's *Comical Gallant* (1702), from *The Merry Wives*, alters Sir Hugh Evans but little. Mrs ap Shinkin, a 'Welsh Runt', appears in Baker's *Act at Oxford* (1704). Though her speech is without peculiarity, there are several typical references. In the revised play, *Hampstead Heath* (1705), her scenes are almost identical. The Welshness of Sir Rice ap Adam, in Estcourt's *Fair Example* (1706), begins and ends with his name. In Shadwell's *Humours of the Army* (1713) Major Cadwallader is thoroughly conventional. Molloy's *Half-Pay Officers* (1720) introduces Fluellen (as well as Macmorris) modernized, but sometimes using the original words. *The Prison Breaker* (1725) contains a Welsh lawyer, slightly nationalized.

The representation of Welsh peculiarities of speech is much simplified, and writers are inclined to depend on the indication of a few points only. $p=b$ is consistently used; $t=d$, plurals for singulars, and *her* for other pronouns, are very frequent; $f=v$, $c=g$, and s , sh , or $ch=j$, are common. *Look you*, *hark you*, and *Cot's splutter her nails* are noticeable expressions.

1760-1800. In this period Welsh characters are few compared with Scottish, and exceedingly few compared with Irish. There are four in Mrs Griffith's *School for Rakes* (1769). These are slightly nationalized, but do not use dialect. Dr Druid, a tutor in Cumberland's *Fashionable Lover* (1772), tends to drop his Welsh pronunciation when he utters moral sentiments. Ap Hugh uses dialect, and sings a Welsh song, in C. Dibdin's *Liberty-Hall* (1785). Captain Leek, in Stuart's *Stone*

¹ Cf. *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, 343, *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, I, 1, *Valiant Welshman*, I, 1; *Match at Midnight*, I, 1.

² Cf. *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject*, I, 1; *Shoemaker a Gentleman*, III; *For the Honour of Wales; Pilgrim*, IV, II.

³ Cf. *Northward Ho*, I, 1; W.S.'s *The Puritan* (1607), I, II.

⁴ Cf. *Northward Ho*, I, 1; Middleton's *Family of Love* (1608), IV, II.

⁵ I.e. *digon*=enough; *cymraeg*=Welsh, *tawson*=be silent.

Eater (1788), is strongly nationalized. In O'Keeffe's *Highland Reel* (1788), the only dialect is in the small parts of Parson Owen and Taffy. Squire Shinken ap Lloyd, in Hurlstone's *Crotchset Lodge* (1795), and Taffline, a maidservant in Prince Hoare's *The Three and the Deuce* (1795), show conventional speech, but little more. In Reynolds' *Fortune's Fool* (1796), the main character, Ap Hazard, 'the aukward beau of Llangothlen', scarcely shows his nationality. This is also true of the Welsh characters in Cumberland's *The Last of the Family* (1797), and Charlotte Smith's *What is She?* (1799). One character in Boaden's *Cambro-Britons* (1798) uses a little dialect. No doubt in some cases the actors provided the Welsh pronunciation.

The chief references are to pride of pedigree¹, goats,² cheese,³ and leeks.⁴ Others are very few.

The pronunciation is further simplified. $p=b$, $t=d$, and $c=g$, are fairly consistently used. $f=v$, plurals for singulars, and *her* for other pronouns are fairly common. Other indications are very rare. *Look you* and *Cot's splutter a nails* occur a few times.

The history of the stage Welshman before 1800 is then to be summed up as: in popularity, an early and rapid rise followed by a continuous decline; and, in conventionality, an extremely swift development in comparatively few years, followed by a long and more or less static period, in which the main change is a reduction in the number of points which are treated conventionally, not in the conventionality of their treatment.

The popularity of the stage Scotsman grew gradually and slowly, and he is insignificant before 1630.⁵ The Welshman became popular as soon as he appeared on the stage, but from 1620 that popularity declined,⁵ and he is insignificant in the later eighteenth century. Like the stage Irishman, these illustrate the development of a stock character, though not so clearly and fully, because the Scotsman hardly enters the third stage during the period under review, while the Welshman seems to have passed the first stage before he appears in the theatre. In the case of the Scotsman, conventionality keeps more or less level with the growth of popularity; but it is worth note that the Welshman, even when his popularity has greatly declined, remains at least as conventional as he was at its peak. Such conventions are very tenacious of life, and, once established, it would seem that they are only destroyed by a return to realism. But it is interesting to observe that while Yeats and Lady Gregory and Synge and O'Casey dealt the stage Irishman a severe blow, yet, in the more recent performances of O'Casey's plays, if not the old stage Irishman, at least a stock character shows a tendency to appear.

In dealing shortly with such a subject as these stock characters, it seems impossible to avoid making the whole position appear to be more cut-and-dried than it actually is. This caveat apart, however, the general lines of their development show themselves fairly clearly.

J. O. BARTLEY

CALCUTTA.

¹ Cf. *School for Rakes*, *Fashionable Lover*; Kenrick's *Duellist* (1773); *Liberty-Hall*; *Crotchset Lodge*; *Last of the Family*; *Cambro-Britons*; also Sullivan's recitation *The Test of Union and Loyalty* (1797).

² Cf. *Liberty-Hall*; Davies's *Generous Counterfeit* (1786); *Stone Eater*; Colman the elder's *Ut Pictura Poesis* (1789); *Crotchset Lodge*; also *The Test of Union and Loyalty*.

³ Cf. Daniel Downright's *Bastard Child* (1768); *Jubilee... at Waterford* (1773); Colman the younger's *Battle of Hexam* (1789); also *The Test of Union and Loyalty*.

⁴ Cf. *Stone Eater*, *Liberty-Hall*; also *The Test of Union and Loyalty*.

⁵ Cf. the figures in the previous article on the stage Irishman, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* XXXVII (1942), 447.

‘MARGUERITE’

The woman whom Matthew Arnold made the heroine of his love poetry was lost to him as soon as their association ceased. The poet was left to wonder what life she had resumed, and what she there became. Since his time it has been hard not to ask similar questions; and others, of which Arnold presumably knew the answer, as whence came she, and who was she. If one can be justified in wishing to discover what the poet tried to hide, it is through the belief that Arnold's intensest poetic gifts came to realization with the touch of this lyric experience. Our research then is directed to the inquiry: What can be known about ‘Marguerite’, and is she the heroine of all Arnold's love poems?

Apart from certain poems addressed to his wife and sister, there remains a definite series of which the theme appears to be the same and to hinge on the love story which preceded his marriage. This series has been variously enlarged or contracted by different critics. Eleven years ago Professor Garrod, in his *Poetry and the Criticism of Life*, added to the two groups of love poems, known as *Switzerland* and *Faded Leaves*, others not obviously of the same inspiration, including *The Voice*, *Tristram and Iseult*, *The Buried Life*, *Lines written by a Deathbed*, the Obermann poems, *The Youth of Nature* and *The Youth of Man*; basing this suggestion on their thought and emotional content, as well as on their position in the volume of 1852, Arnold's most important volume of poetry.¹

Professor Hale (*Select Poems of Matthew Arnold*, 1908) traced the influence of Marguerite in twenty-one poems, being surely justified in adding *Urania* and *Euphrosyne* (in 1852 known as *Excuse* and *Indifference*) to the *Switzerland* group. He, with Professor Garrod and Sir Edmund Chambers, also joined the poems of *Faded Leaves* to the same subject. The theory that lines or fragments originally designed for the *Switzerland* group were utilized during the period of courtship of his future wife seems, in spite of the serious claim to that effect (made by C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry in *The Poetry of Matthew Arnold*, 1940, pp. 168–72), not easily tenable. One would have to suppose that four years of married life had seemed long to Arnold, if at the end of that time he could describe the poems of his courtship as ‘faded leaves’. The above writers admit (op. cit. p. 168) that Wyndham Slade refers to the poet as quoting from *Faded Leaves* in 1849, i.e. before he had met Miss Wightman; which, if correct, would be conclusive. The tone of *Calais Sands*, indisputably addressed to her, is not the lyric voice of Marguerite's lover; nor is the description of Miss Wightman, ‘die unerreichbare schone’, and Matthew's *agacement* on her account (given in a letter to Slade, now published by these authors, p. 169) very convincing evidence that his excitement about his future fiancée was an emotion comparable with that aroused by the tragedy of his first love. This was a peerless passion, and had an unequalled influence on his art at least, if not his life.²

I have elsewhere set forth the history of the appearance of the love poems, their confusing changes of place and title, their separation and regrouping. The *Collected Edition* of 1869, with its definitive arrangement of the poems under two headings, seemed to confirm the belief that a division existed. Subsequent endeavours to

¹ *The Voice* is of 1849.

² In her sympathetic and interesting article on ‘Matthew Arnold's literary relations with France’, *Modern Language Review*, xxxiii, 1938, 204–5, Miss F. Wickelgren wonders if a few

weeks' experience could have had so profound an effect. Though she recognizes what is graceful and touching in Arnold's love-story, she hesitates to accept it literally.

read the poems as they originally appeared have involved a readjustment, which the mind grasps easily enough but which sentiment in some cases is slower to accept.

Switzerland in 1869 included the following poems: *A Memory-Picture*, *Meeting*, *Parting*, *A Farewell*, *Isolation: To Marguerite*, *To Marguerite: continued*, *The Terrace at Berne* (*A Dream*, originally a member of the group, was not reprinted until 1881).

The poems known as *Faded Leaves* comprised in 1869 *The River*, *Too Late*, *On the Rhine*, *Longing* and *Separation*. They received their title in *Second Series*, 1855, having occurred in the same order on their first appearance in 1852.¹ Interleaved with them (in 1852) were the two poems *Excuse* and *Indifference*: immediately following came four of the lyrics later denominated *Switzerland*. They were given this title in the 1853 volume (called *First Series*), and then included one new poem, *A Dream*, with the poem *To my Friends*, repeated from Arnold's first volume of 1849. The *Faded Leaves* group was omitted from the 1853 volume, but reappeared, with *Switzerland*, in 1855. In 1852 the love lyrics and seven other poems, including *Tristram and Iseult*, constituted the middle section of the volume *Empedocles on Etna and other Poems*. The title poem made up the first section: the remaining third section contained many which have been tenably associated with the prevailing love theme, including *The Buried Life* and *Dover Beach*.

On the internal evidence *Marguerite* is a definite figure, although, taxed by his daughters, the poet is supposed to have denied her reality. Certainly what we can glean about her amounts to very little, and this little is often vague and chiefly surrounds her person and character. Various theories as to her identity and social status have been proposed, which have tried to take into account, if not explain, the fact of a young French girl summering in an hotel at Thun, and indefinitely described by Arnold as one of its inmates (Letter to Clough, 29 September 1848),² not obviously accompanied by or accompanying anyone, unless it be 'Olivia'. (But although the same cannot now be conceded of 'Marguerite', 'Olivia' may be a fictitious personage. She has no specific character and appears only once in the poems. Her name is almost certainly invented.)

Reference must here be made to the suggestion of Mr L. Trilling, who takes for a possibility, if not a probability, that *Marguerite* was a person of very low social status, and morals. She is on this interpretation a servant cleaning the stairs (op. cit. p. 123) with a duster (?) tied round her hair (see *Meeting*). If this be so, she is an unusual domestic! She has the freedom of the house, talks or sings in bird-like³ tones about her work, reads *Ortis*, and has captivated the dandyish Matthew Arnold, no longer at that time an impressionable student, but private secretary to Lord Lansdowne and nearer twenty-six than twenty-five. Arnold is moreover not ashamed to kiss her before his 'friends' (*A Memory-Picture*, first called *To my Friends*, who ridiculed a tender *Leave-Taking*). This last act seems to dispose of the servant hypothesis. But much depends on who were the 'friends'.

¹ Except for *Separation*, which is of 1855.

² In his *Matthew Arnold* (1939), L. Trilling states that someone should explore the registers of the Hotel Bellevue at Thun, named in Arnold's letter; but this I have done. The registers for the first half of the century were lacking, except for the period 15 July 1834 to 7 September 1838. In this period were entered many English, French, Dutch, German and even Russian names, often of noble families, who consistently declared,

themselves satisfied with the 'bonne tenue' of the house. I also consulted archives of the Rathaus and Historical Museum for a possible clue, and found many 'Marguerites' whose deaths were registered at Thun, but no evidence to identify any one of them with Arnold's 'Marguerite'. His fondness for the name indicates that it may have been her real one.

³ 'Lute-like' if *The Voice* is the voice of *Marguerite*, as seems almost certain.

Were they just the passing friends of his stay, fellow guests at the hotel? Were they simply 'Olivia' and 'Martin' (*A Dream*), as Professors Tinker and Lowry suggest? I have elsewhere pointed out that Arnold was apparently travelling alone at the time (*Matthew Arnold and France*, 1935, p. 108, note 1). We might suppose Marguerite to have been the manager's or even the concierge's daughter, a 'little girl' for the purposes of a kiss; he could hardly have embraced publicly in the hotel anyone of lower social standing. Although France is Marguerite's home (*The Terrace at Berne*), yet her father must then have taken a temporary post for the summer season at Thun. However, Marguerite's father is too remote a problem, and it is doubtful if such a person were with her in any case.¹

The chambermaid hypothesis of Mr Trilling is largely based on the word 'kerchief' (the term employed by Arnold), with its implication of inferior social status. This apparently small detail may perhaps throw light on the other problem, of the possible double identity of the heroine of the two sets of poems. This 'kerchief' was 'fringed' (*A Memory-Picture*); its long fringes fell on Marguerite's 'pale cheek'. It was almost certainly silken; a woollen fringe would hardly fall prettily enough for the poet to comment on it as 'fluttering'. A picturesque piece of lilac silk chiffon might be worn by a woman in any station of life to-day; in Marguerite's day it would not perhaps have been correct for a woman of standing. Note however that she does wear a hat, in *A Dream*. Arnold's describing the covering as a kerchief may have been due to a poetical or even masculine confusion as to the nomenclature of the parts of woman's dress. Men have odd terms for familiar domestic articles and female appurtenances. Arnold's real carelessness about physical details of description may also have some relevancy here.²

But the 'kerchief', apart from the above mystification, may have played its part, as well as trammelling Marguerite's hair, of confusing the world as to the colour of that hair. For one of the arguments on internal evidence for separating the two groups of poems, *Switzerland* and *Faded Leaves*, and assigning them to different heroines, has been the apparent discrepancy in the colour of the hair of the supposed two women. The colour of the eyes is another difficulty, but the colour of the hair is the more serious stumbling-block. It is 'ash-colour'd'³ in the *Switzerland* group, 'brown' in *Faded Leaves*. But it may be questioned whether Arnold himself was sure of the exact shade. Did he even observe Marguerite's hair properly, covered as it generally seemed to be by the kerchief, almost hidden in *A Memory-Picture*? Supposing that he saw it more closely at times, and with colder vision, it is still possible that he was careless about the shade. He may of course have intentionally wished to be vague. Or perhaps he did not think the question a very material one. It seems most likely that he did not observe the shade accurately. Have we not, in the case of his own hair, his fanciful description of it in *Thyrsis* as 'brown...sprent with grey', when in real life he was to be proud of its blackness and its never going grey? If black can be brown for poetic reasons, so ash-coloured may be brown, too, especially as it is a difficult colour to put in a short line. Mr Greening Lamborn (*The Rudiments of Criticism*, p. 75) has pointed out that Arnold did sometimes get colours wrong in nature, as when he described

¹ Another conjecture is that she was the daughter of a guide attached to the hotel; but these were almost always Swiss, and there is positive evidence against this hypothesis in a letter of Arnold's, written from Leukerbad, 29 September 1848 (*Letters of Arnold to Clough*, ed. Lowry, p. 92).

² The expression 'a poet so uncommonly

scrupulous about descriptive detail as Arnold' in the review of Sir Edmund Chambers's *Matthew Arnold*, and *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. Dover Wilson, in *T.L.S.* 21 April 1932, is misleading.

³ It may not be frivolous to mention here that I am told there is a classical shade of brown, known (at least to hair dyers) as 'dark ash-blond' and distinguished by a certain lustre.

the 'green' roots and 'yellowing' stalks of the corn, and the 'black' backs of the swallows, and elsewhere Dr Garrod corroborates this criticism by saying that Arnold was not a good observer of detail. His inaccuracies in description (as of the Brontë sisters' graves in the long grass) are another question.

Finally it is possible that Arnold was simply hazy and forgetful, as he actually feared he might be in *A Memory-Picture*.

If the colour of the hair seemed an inconsistency, so also the colour of the eyes remained a difficulty. The eyes have been represented as obviously belonging to different heroines, and 'grey' and 'blue' then become thorough antinomies. The heroine of *Switzerland*, Marguerite, has eyes stately 'blue' (in *Meeting and Parting*, and in the letter to Clough) while she of *Faded Leaves* (in *Separation*) has 'grey' eyes.

But observe here that the poet had already, in the first set of poems, confused the colour of Marguerite's eyes, making them 'blue' (as also in *A Memory-Picture*) in *Meeting and Parting*, and 'grey' in *Absence*. In these three poems Marguerite is specifically in question and is directly named. The argument that the heroine of *Faded Leaves* (though even here it would be difficult to show she was necessarily his future wife) is quite another person than Marguerite, is hardly borne out then by the evidence of the eye colouring. One interpretation of *Separation* is that the grey eyes and brown hair here described are also those of *Calais Sands*, where they unquestionably refer to his future wife. Apart, however, from the quite different tone and accent of the latter poem, which appear alone enough to separate it from those under discussion, it is precisely a grey-eyed stranger (in *Absence*) who reminds him of Marguerite.

The question is resolved by Arnold himself, who must have intended an intermediate shade. In *On the Rhine*, the deep soft lucent hue of his loved one's eyes is deliberately left indeterminate. They are 'eyes too expressive to be blue, too lovely to be grey'. That is the heroine of *Faded Leaves*. But how could this description apply to any other woman than the heroine of *Switzerland* whose eyes hesitate between blue and grey? It is almost an attempt at an explanation by the poet himself, a concession to the desire for a clear-cut distinction.

Finally, in *Tristram and Iseult* the portrait of Vivien, the mocking gleeful fay (see note 1, p. 293), who seems clearly founded on Marguerite, combines the two features, the 'brown locks' with the 'blue eyes'; the last difficulty is smoothed out.

But far more important than these physical features, in regard to the extent of Marguerite's dominion, are the psychological traits noted by the poet. Professor Garrod wished to make all the youthful love poems bespeak Marguerite and radiate from the one woman, and he included with them the longer *Tristram and Iseult*. His faith was borne out by the release of facts showing when and where the inspiration of this poem had come, at Thun, in Switzerland, in 1848 or 1849.¹ To Professor Garrod the 1852 volume was Marguerite's book: he would not have thought it misentitled *The Forsaken Merman*,² instead of *Empedocles on Etna*.

The Buried Life has in particular a deep affinity with the love poems. *Requiescat* is almost certainly another member.³ The Obermann poems, of which the emotional content is so completely in harmony with the love poems, were associated also by Professor Garrod with the series. My study of the influence of Senancour on

¹ See *Matthew Arnold and France*, p. 140.

² The *Forsaken Merman* had appeared in 1849. It may not be straining the metaphor to seek a fanciful parallel between the Merman's story and Arnold's—the poet of the cold English sea-caves,

deserted by the southern-hearted French girl. There is also in this poem a possible hint that the division between Arnold and Marguerite had some religious basis.

³ See note 1, p. 293.

Arnold, showing its contemporaneity with his experience of hopeless passion, fully confirmed Professor Garrod's view. Mrs Carol Romer's charming article in *The Nineteenth Century* (vol xcix, no. 592, June 1926) had also pointed to the close association of the two topics.

The portrait of the subject of the love poems, as it emerges from the faint indications we have, is that of a very gracious and alluring young girl. And the scattered details blend and harmonize in such a way as to render it strange that there should be any question of a second subject. If some of Marguerite's traits are vague and general characters—her youthfulness, joyousness, naturalness—they are so repeatedly referred to and stressed that Arnold would seem to have wished to characterize her chiefly by their possession. Indeed, joy to him was the pre-eminent gift,¹ the touchstone of quality in life as in art (see his 'oracular quatrain' placed at the head of volume I of the *Collected Edition* of 1869; afterwards reinstated, as in *New Poems*, within the text). The sardonic Heine fell just short of the highest genius because he could criticize better than he could charm. Marguerite so perfectly represented this joyous spirit for Arnold (*Euphrosyne*) that in the end he deemed her placed above and beyond him by virtue of it (*Urania*), this was a part of the cause of their separation. Professor Garrod thought that Arnold's colder academic character and training may well have been the chief alienating influence.

Among the more precise traits consistently attributed to Marguerite by the poet are her tenderness, mockery, archness. The 'arch eyes and mocking mouth' of *The River (Faded Leaves)* harmonize with the 'archest chin Mockery ever ambush'd in' of *A Memory-Picture (Switzerland)*. Can one imagine that poet's disgrace who would strip his mistress of her most entrancing features in order to deck out another? Marguerite's mockery was not, however, deep-seated, for the blue kind eyes of *A Memory-Picture (Switzerland)* are one with those of the 'kind' heroine of *Longing (Faded Leaves)*. These are constant features.

Again, the attitude of the poet to his mistress is the same in both *Switzerland* and *Faded Leaves*. Arnold is somewhat of a trifler to the critics who suppose him driven through a train of emotions of a similar kind towards two different women. The generalized passion of love may recur, but the attendant aura of sentiments—sorrows, pains, regrets and tendernesses—are endlessly recombined in other forms and at the bidding of other circumstances.

So it is a constant preoccupation of Arnold's to forecast the changes the years will bring to his love. *Absence*² (*Switzerland*) and *Separation (Faded Leaves)* both

¹ He says in *Requescat*

Her mirth the world required;

She bathed it in smiles of glee.

This gleeful spirit he also gave to Vivien, an avatar of Marguerite. This fay shared the 'morning's fresh clear grace' with Marguerite, whose voice was clear as the morning (*Parting*); and also her gentle mockery

² The argument that Arnold could not have barefacedly read this poem aloud to his sister (as stated in the review in *T.L.S.*, cited above) about one woman when on the point of being engaged to another is not conclusive. One is often willing to betray an emotion, under the cover of literary composition, invoking the excuse of poetic licence to cover a too personal tone, while making self-revelations which one would disavow in real life. At the time of the

appearance of *Empedocles*, in which Arnold felt himself often to be the speaker, he pretended such a view was unjustified, and attempted to clear himself in his mother's eyes by explaining that he must not be identified with his hero (Letter of 16 November 1867). The accepted mingling of personal and impersonal elements in literature allows a writer to avoid being identified too closely with his productions.

It is an inescapable fact that the publication of some of the saddest love poetry in our language took place almost immediately after the author's marriage to a woman who could not, at the most, claim their whole inspiration. Probably his wife was in his confidence. Into the feelings of Mrs Arnold, obviously not the cause of so much lyric woe and perhaps glad not to be, we cannot enter.

include this theme, expressed in practically the same way. The analogy between the two memories called up by the two stanzas, of *Absence* and *Separation*; and between the two heroines' fancied change and ageing, in *The Terrace at Berne* (Switzerland) and *Separation*, and the author's shrinking from the knowledge of it, seem conclusively to establish a single subject. Even the variations on the theme are not very distinct. In *Separation* he would prefer the death of all remembrance, rather than a distorted or incomplete one, of his mistress. In *Absence* he recognizes that forgetfulness will not depend on his will, but will be imposed upon him. In *The Terrace at Berne* he endures an evocation of Marguerite greatly changed from the woman he had known ten years before, but his love returns with added poignancy to cast out the fancied image; and with it to cast away all hope for ever of reunion.

This last theme of loss and separation, the dread that haunts the poet of the inevitable barrier between human souls, not to be broken down by even such a love as his, is developed in poems outside the *Switzerland* and *Faded Leaves* group. The close of *The Terrace at Berne*, the two poems variously entitled during their history but finally known as *Isolation: to Marguerite* and *To Marguerite: continued*,¹ are inspired by the same sense of inner loneliness as gives its theme to *The Buried Life*. The Senancourian melancholy, which bids the poet rather tame his desires than attempt their gratification, finds a place in both sets of poems, in *A Farewell*, *To Marguerite* and *Absence* (Switzerland) and in *The River* and *On the Rhine* (*Faded Leaves*).

A further argument for connecting the poems is the similarity of setting. The story of the heroine of *Switzerland* is unfolded in the one place, for a long time now identified as Thun. Two poems in *Faded Leaves*, *Too Late* and *Separation*, are independent of site, but the first member, *The River*, seems unquestionably to refer to the Aar at Thun, the river of *A Dream*. *The River* revives the picture, more definitely described in *Meeting* (originally *The Lake*) and *Parting*. No other swans and poplars can surely be in question than those which swim upon and fringe the Aar. *On the Rhine*,² the fourth member of *Faded Leaves*, was written

¹ The first lines of this poem, 'Yes! in the sea of life enlisted', etc., seem to be directly acquiescing in a passage from *Pendennis* where the idea is the same, if expressed more prosily. Thackeray, concluding a paragraph in which he has been describing how all the inmates of a household have their own points of view and live in separate worlds, writes - '... you and I are but a pair of infinite isolations, with some fellow islands a little more or less near to us.'

Pendennis was published in monthly parts in 1849-50, which fits in with the assumed date of Arnold's poem. *To Marguerite continued* was originally entitled in the volume of 1852 *To Marguerite, in returning a volume of the Letters of Otis*, but appeared under the title *Isolation* in the third edition of *First Series*, 1857. (The poem now called *Isolation: To Marguerite* was there called simply *To Marguerite* and appeared there for the first time; its date of composition must remain conjectural, but it was possibly composed much earlier.) The similarity in thought appears to be more than a coincidence. I am indebted to Mr J. T. Hackett for pointing out the resemblance (in *My commonplace Book*: T. Fisher Unwin, 1919, pp. 265-6), although this gentleman

imagined Arnold's poem to be many years prior in composition to *Pendennis* and attributed the similar thought to the spirit of the age working on very different minds.

² Professors Tinker and Lowry believe that the journey 'On the Rhine' is that referred to at the end of *Calais Sands*, and that the poem was probably written during a continental tour in 1850. *Calais Sands* was certainly written in 1850 at Calais (although not published until 1867) under the spur of a refusal from Sir William Wightman. Could these 'difficulties of courtship' have provoked in the young man a repetition of the sorrow, couched almost in the same strain, that was caused him only a year earlier, by Marguerite?

Arnold had returned from Thun in 1848 by the Rhine, and without knowing the contrary to be true, we may well conjecture that he returned to Thun in 1849 by the same route (see *Letters of Arnold to Clough*, p. 91).

There is certainly little affinity between the tone of *Calais Sands* and that of *On the Rhine*—the one calm, possessive (for in spite of the veto on him Miss Wightman is 'my queen'), mature; the other wistful, racked, intense. The above-

with an inward view of the same scene as he pursued his way in all probability back to Marguerite and the Alps, on his second visit to Thun, 1849.

And lastly, the 'radiant climes' of *Longing*, whence his love comes to this 'new world' of her lover, may well refer to the Swiss scene, the goal of so many English, weary of grey skies. It is to turn aside blindfold to ignore the similarities of setting in these poems, their reiteration of the same emotions, their evocation of a parallel train of thoughts. All the indications are that they refer to but one episode in the poet's life, and to one woman.

With regard to the many conjectures advanced as to who was the woman adored by Matthew Arnold with so vivid if vague a passion, it is but just that she be freed from the ugly associations of chambermaid, loose woman, or even servant companion, with their slur also upon Arnold. The conjecture of Mr Hugh Kingsmill, that she was some sort of governess, might seem to account for what was unusual in her situation. He, however, clings to the idea, also held by Mr Trilling, of her unchastity. The latter felt that the reproaches the poet addresses to his mistress in *Parting* proved that she had had lovers before; without allowing for the fact that this is an old complaint of lovers, a corollary of the jealous and exclusive nature of love. It is quite in the classical tradition (vide the story of Alphonse and Bélasure in Mme de la Fayette's *Zayde*) for a lover to be tortured by thoughts of his mistress's imaginary perfidies committed before he was in question. The poet's anxiety on this score must not be allowed to reflect too seriously on Marguerite.

But Mr Trilling goes further. Marguerite's future, as well as her past, is a source of grave misgivings (Mr Trilling states that I ignore this aspect of the question, but see p. 129 of my *Matthew Arnold and France*). The poet already fancies he sees her a member of the *demi-monde*, according to the above writer. This is a tragic deduction. Arnold's picture of Marguerite growing old, forsaking the simple scarf for one more lacy and fashionable, wearing rouge above all (it is on the indulgence in these worn feminine devices that Mr Trilling seems to base his conviction) points with equal validity to the view that she was of good class. So one might imagine any older woman taking her unremarked place in French social life.

Could one indeed attribute to Arnold, with his gentlemanly English ideas, this odious one, of accusing his mistress of so grave a fall? At least he would have put the thought aside and not into a poem. It is more probable that he simply disliked having to think of her as outgrowing the ingenuousness and innocence of youth. There seems no need to put another construction on the phrase, 'the flowery track'.

named writers go even further than attributing the latter poem to Miss Wightman's influence: they even fancy she may be the grey-eyed stranger in *Absence*, whose role it is there to recall to the poet his old agitation about Marguerite. This is more than a fair ration of inspiration to Miss Wightman. It is enough to concede the possibility of the 'charmingly romantic link' (*T.L.S.* reviewer, 21 April 1932) which would make her the heroine of *Faded Leaves*, without going further. She may possibly be the original of Eugenia in *Philomela*, but a Eugenia had already occurred in *Horation Echo* (1847); it would be better at least not to give her the adulterated part of Marguerite's understudy. Fausta (old-style pronunciation), the other woman of the poems, was of course his sister, Mrs Forster. This seems sufficient to account for the name, without

the added idea that she was a female Faust (Trilling, op. cit. pp. 99-100). Before her marriage, he had already called her by this name in *To Fausta. a Question*, 1849, perhaps teasingly. He may have thought this later not in good taste, for the poem was afterwards called simply *A Question*. Fausta occurs also in *Resignation*.

A piece of evidence against retaining Marguerite as the principal in *Faded Leaves* is the statement, in an anonymous letter, attributed to Thomas Arnold (so described by Mr Alan Harris in *The Nineteenth Century*, April 1933), that the poem recorded a 'counterblast' in Arnold's relations with Miss Wightman. This may have been an intended concealment, like Arnold's affirmation that the Switzerland experiences were purely imaginary; dictated by reserve and delicacy.

If Marguerite, then, did not in Arnold's fancy belong to the *demi-monde* by this time, the other alternative must be accepted: that she had become a woman of society, of some standing and class, and that her circumstances when Arnold knew her were such as to lead him to regard this future for her as probable or inevitable. A country girl or servant would be unlikely to assume the dress he describes in his picture of the future.

The chief evidence for her being a governess or companion Mr Kingsmill finds in *A Dream*. In this poem Olivia appears, Marguerite accompanying or accompanied by her. Marguerite here has abandoned the offending kerchief and wears a hat like Olivia. If this is not sufficient to equate them socially we may note that the poet calls both by their Christian names; either for poetic reasons or from familiarity. At all events it seems to preclude Marguerite's being companion or servant of the 'lady' Olivia. An alternative hypothesis to which Mr Trilling may subscribe is that both were chambermaids; Mr Kingsmill would have to make them both teachers.

But Marguerite's unconventionality, if natural in a servant, would ill become either governess or companion. On such devolves generally the onus of actually setting examples of virtuous and discreet behaviour, or at least of having some of the qualities of chaperone or duenna. It is therefore necessary to supplement this theory by thinking of her as a governess on holiday, and making a stay in Switzerland. But this supposition is hardly borne out by Arnold's expectation, in *A Memory-Picture*, of making a yearly tryst with her at the same place, in *The Terrace at Berne* he actually speculates as to whether she is not still there; it is in remembering the incongruity of an older woman at play among the oleanders in the garden that he sees her as he supposes she must really have become—mature, a society belle, perhaps—if indeed not dead. This is ten years later, and indicates that she must have had the habit of a yearly prolonged stay, if she were not altogether domiciled at Thun.¹ In fine, we cannot assume that her relaxed manners were holiday ones.

It is unsatisfactory to have to conclude that the independence which Marguerite enjoyed was somehow exceptional; and that the data regarding her movements and person are inadequate to reconcile the anomalies of her situation. She may plausibly have been one of two daughters of some wealthy and eccentric widower, and allowed unusual freedom; this might perhaps be rendered easier by the fact of their not being in their native town or province, but in a health resort. At least her association with Arnold was known and above-board, if we may accept as testimony the title poem *To my Friends, who ridiculed a Tender Leave-taking*. Would Arnold have embraced her openly had there been reason for shame in the action? It is more likely that the rather cold blood of the Englishman never took him as far in reality as he went in thought, and that there had to be an atmosphere of merrymaking to rid even this scene of its sentimental aspect, in order for it to take place at all.

It is even probable that in the whole series of poems Arnold had recourse to much poetical exaggeration (this would further extenuate his innocent denial to his daughters) and that the one ridiculed kiss of *A Memory-Picture* comprised the worst, or the best, of the affair. In *Longing* he says with an accent of great sadness that Marguerite (unless it be Miss Wightman he meant) never in truth *did* come to him, and kiss his brow, and smooth his hair, as he longed in imagination she

¹ The argument against the latter hypothesis is Arnold's words, 'France, thy home'.

might do. Yet had she come, so vividly and often had he pictured it, he would have thought it not for the first time.

Whatever exaggeration or wishful thinking added to the story, if many of the experiences of the poems were only fond invention, it is a fact that Arnold spent part of September 1848 at Thun with Marguerite, and was there with her the same month in the following year. Though the poems may have embroidered on what happened, the poet must have had some opportunity during his stay with her for acquaintance and intimacy. *The Terrace at Berne* reads like an exact evocation of a real, not an imaginary, experience. If it be so, the difficulty remains how a girl of good family could have had any such intimacy with Arnold or have been left alone with him for periods in or near their hotel (unless Olivia were always present). If Marguerite were delicate, being very young, she might have been sent away regularly for the summer and autumn cure by parents who would possibly consider an older girl a suitable duenna. As she was an 'inmate' of the hotel, and not a servant (which seems unthinkable), then she must have been a guest, on an indefinite sojourn either for pleasure or health. Certainly Marguerite was not robust; the epithet 'fair', often referred to as meaning that her hair was fair, also included the idea of a somewhat wan loveliness, and her figure was delicate and pliant.

She might have been, again, one of a French colonial family, with freer manners than those allowed by European conventions, or perhaps the child of an unconventional artist, a sort of minor George Sand. There is no evidence to support these guesses. One would like to think of her as resembling the American girls described by Henry James—an astonishment to the severe eighties; the poetical Daisy Millers of Europe, or the more intelligent Christina Lights; emancipated yet charming, with their bare arms, light dresses and free, radiant allure.

IRIS E. SELLS

DURHAM

MONTESQUIEU AND BRITISH EDUCATION IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

We are so accustomed to associating the cause of education in the latter part of the eighteenth century with the two names of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, that it may come as something of a surprise to encounter a third. Yet in England there is ample evidence to show that the brief and scanty pages devoted by Montesquieu to the subject of education in *L'Esprit des Loïs* (1748)¹ excited an interest comparable to that aroused by *Emile* and much greater than that produced by *Leonard and Gertrude* or Pestalozzi's later works. Montesquieu's condensed reflexions on education would, however, probably have attracted little notice, and certainly have had little influence, divorced from the vast political, legal and sociological setting in which he inserted them.

During the second half of the eighteenth century, education, like most other social institutions in England, was in a lamentably amorphous state. There was nothing deserving the name of a system. The Grammar Schools provided a semblance of education for the lower middle classes who, unable to aspire to the Universities, prepared themselves for the indigent respectability of a counting-house. The children of the poor were either totally neglected or picked up a few crumbs of learning at a dame's school or at one of the many endowed charities. The public schools and universities catered mainly for the aristocracy, especially those who, being younger sons, were destined for the church. The professional or upper middle class, upon whose shoulders the burden of administration so largely fell, was left to choose between the training of a clerk and that of a cleric. It was this gap in English educational arrangements that Dr Joseph Priestley endeavoured to fill with his *Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life* (1765). And it was here that Montesquieu's influence, for good or ill, was most strongly felt.

In essence, Montesquieu's contribution to educational theory consisted in restoring to the intellectual currency of the time an idea of Aristotle, who had said,

Of all the things which I have mentioned, that which most contributes to the permanence of constitutions is the adaptation of education to the form of government. . . . The best laws, though sanctioned by every citizen of the state, will be of no avail unless the young are trained by habit and education in the spirit of the constitution; if the laws are democratical, democratical, or oligarchical if the laws are oligarchical.²

Locke had indeed revived the state utilitarianism implied in this doctrine, for in his *Treatise on Government* he taught that education should aim at producing good citizens rather than good men. In Montesquieu it is not so much doctrine as pure, indeed somewhat bitter, observation. He saw that the stability of an imperfect social and political system like the French depended upon the imperfection of its parts. As an educationalist Aristotle took too much cognizance of the state, Rousseau too little. Montesquieu contented himself with the observation that a given political order engenders the kind of education which subserves its own ends. In monarchies education will have honour (that is 'false honour') for its goal, in republics, virtue; in despotic states, fear (*E.L.* iv, i).

England being a constitutional monarchy resembling a republic (*E.L.* xi, 6), English education, as relating to a monarchy, tends to excite ambition with the promise of public recognition and reward; and, as relating to a democracy, it

¹ *Esprit des Loïs*, Bk. iv, ch. 1-v.

² Aristotle, *Politics*, v, 9 (Jowett's translation). Cf. also, *Politics*, viii, 1: 'The citizen should be

moulded to suit the form of government under which he lives.'

inculcates moral integrity in all conduct, political, civil or domestic. Virtue here will not be expected to be its own reward, as in a true republic, but will be recompensed with honours. Thus will the private interest of the individual become identified with the public interest of the state ¹

General relation between education and government Among the more prominent Englishmen who studied Montesquieu with enthusiasm, some, like Lord Chesterfield, understood that education should be rigorously subordinated to the nature and purposes of government; others, like Goldsmith and Thomas Gray, while they agreed that education must inevitably take its distinguishing colour from government, denied that it *ought* to be slavishly submitted to it. Goldsmith, in a passage of his *Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning* (1759), plainly inspired by Montesquieu, makes intellectual progress directly dependent upon national character, upon the permanence and freedom of the constitution, and upon the soil and climate; but he nowhere suggests that education ought to be given a bias in favour of existing political institutions. The poet Gray, who, it will be recalled, was also Professor of History at Cambridge, gave the problem his earnest attention. *L'Esprit des Loix* appears to have fallen into his hands while he was composing his poem *The Alliance of Education and Government*, that is, in August 1748, which must have been immediately after the book was published.² His own treatment of the theme now appeared so unsatisfactory to Gray that he dropped it. 'Some time later', says Gosse, 'he thought of taking it up again, and was about to compose a prefatory ode to M. de Montesquieu when that writer died, on the 10th February 1755, and the whole thing was abandoned.' Gibbon was particularly disgusted at this step and deplored that Gray should waste his genius on the compilation of chronological tables instead of finishing 'the philosophical poem of which he has left such an exquisite specimen'. The fragment discusses the influence of good government and climate upon education:

So fond Instruction on the growing powers
Of Nature idly lavishes her stores,
If equal Justice, with unclouded face,
Smile not indulgent on the rising race.

But Gray revolts against the idea of the complete ascendancy of climate over the mind, and asks,

Can opener skies and suns of fiercer flame,
O'erpower the fire that animates our frame?

Unmanly thought!

Gray's editor, Mason, has subjoined to the fragment some detached notes by Gray relating to the same subject, from which it is clear the poet intended to develop his theme along lines plainly suggested by Montesquieu. The more interesting of these lay down the doctrine that the legislator should endeavour to counteract by education the vices inherent in particular climates; e.g. 'the particular drift of education should be to make men *think* in the northern climates and *act* in the southern'. Montesquieu had devoted a chapter (*E.L.* xiv, 5) to the discussion 'that those are bad legislators who favour the vices of the climate, and good legislators who oppose those vices'. Gray's poem, had it been completed, would

¹ *E.L.* iii, 7: 'L'honneur fait mouvoir toutes les parties du corps politique; il les lie par son action même; et il se trouve que chacun va au bien commun, croyant aller à ses intérêts particuliers.'

² See Gosse's edition of the *Works of Thomas Gray*, London, 1884, i, 113; also *Life of Gray* by the same, pp. 91-2. Gray's admiration for Montesquieu knew no bounds. V. for example, *Works*, ii (Letters), 190-1 and 199.

almost certainly have been a rhymed version of Montesquieu, and of the true Montesquieu. The 'prefatory Ode' would doubtless have acknowledged the fulness of the debt.

Monarchy: Education and honour. The kind of education Montesquieu conceived to be best adapted to a pure monarchy was egotistic and ornamental in the extreme; and if it could be shown that he sincerely advocated such a training for the young, those critics who revolted against it would be more than justified.¹ But the country Montesquieu had in mind when describing education under the monarchical regime was France. His friend and protector, Lord Chesterfield—like so many of his fellow-nobles in the middle of the eighteenth century—blandly ignoring the democratic side of our constitution, committed the serious error of assuming that the English monarchy was not substantially different from the French.² He accordingly encouraged his son, when in Paris, to cultivate the acquaintance of the French sage,³ and even considered it worth while to transcribe for him, in French,⁴ the whole of the somewhat lengthy chapter devoted by Montesquieu to the subject of education in a monarchy (*E.L.* iv, 2). The essence of this is that conduct is governed not by ethical, but by aesthetic, considerations only, and these of an extremely narrow kind. 'On n'y juge pas les actions des hommes comme bonnes, mais comme belles; non comme justes, mais comme grandes; non comme raisonnables, mais comme extraordinaires.' The aim of education will therefore be to produce a pleasing exterior. It will inculcate 'politesse', not for its own sake, but because of the air of breeding and consequence it gives. It will not condemn the minor vices—gallantry, finesse, cunning, adulation—provided they appear under an adequate polish and are directed towards some 'honourable' goal, such as conquest or fame. It will teach us, above all, to set a value on our fortunes and none on our lives; to exact for ourselves the deference due to our rank or office; and to regard the unwritten laws of honour as more binding than the civil law.⁵

Such is the educational ideal Lord Chesterfield sets up. Montesquieu, on the contrary, merely records its existence in monarchies, and he adds in a note, 'On dit ici ce qui est, et non pas ce qui doit être.' Luzac, indeed, regarded the whole of this chapter as a satire on France: 'On l'aurait accusé d'avoir fait une satire si, au lieu de parler en général, il n'eût indiqué que sa nation.'

Education and the middle class. The education purveyed by the universities and the public schools was conservative in every respect, and its cultural basis was the classics. It was not the products of such a training that could be hoped to redeem the country from the degeneracy and corruption which Dr John Brown⁶ and so many others attributed to it. The hope of the reformers was perforce centred in the middle class. Such of these reformers as turned to Montesquieu for instruction—and they were many—looked then not into his chapters on monarchy, but into those on republics. The most potent voices raised on behalf of the middle class were those of Dr Joseph Priestley and David Williams. Priestley justly complained⁷ that no regular provision was made for the education of men destined

¹ For instance, David Williams in his *Lectures on Political Principles*.

² See a letter from Lord Chesterfield to his son dated 11 June 1750 (O.S.).

³ Letters of 24 December 1750 and 4 February 1751.

⁴ Letter of 11 June 1750 (O.S.).

⁵ Cf. Burke, *Reflections on the French Revolution*: 'It is gone, that sensibility of principle, that

chastity of honour, which felt a stain like a wound which inspired courage while it mitigated ferocity, which ennobled everything it touched, and under which vice itself lost half its evil, by losing all its grossness.'

⁶ Of the *Estimate of the Manners and Customs of the Times* (1757).

⁷ See his *Essay on a Course of Liberal Education for Civil and Active Life* (1765).

to take an active part in civil and political life.¹ The classical type of education he rejects as useless for such a purpose, and substitutes a comprehensive course of civil history and polity—laws, government, institutions, commerce, etc. Such a course he actually professed when a tutor at Warrington. He conceived that for education to have any real relation with government, such as Montesquieu had declared to be essential under any political system, it must begin by giving some account of that government. Many of the sixty-three lectures, of which he gives elaborate outlines, are taken almost *en bloc* from the *Esprit des Lois*, notably 39 (Political and Civil Liberty), 40 (On Despotism), 41 (On Democracy), and 42 (On Aristocracy). It was to be expected that so enthusiastic a follower of Locke as Priestley should not neglect his most distinguished disciple, and, in fact, his constant references to Montesquieu for the most obscure points betray a minute acquaintance with his work. Had Priestley's doctrine been attended to, the extraordinary public interest in politics would not have been lessened, but it would have been founded upon a sure knowledge of history and principles such as would have silenced much of the ignorant pamphleteering of the time.

Some years later—in 1774—another pedagogue, David Williams,² followed up Priestley's attack upon the classical tradition with a demand to make English the basis of education in this country. He sighed for a Montesquieu to arise and save the people of England from venality, corruption and spiritual decay (*Treatise of Education*, pp 21-2), but expressed amazement and disgust

at many of those writers who have lately referred everything to government. All the effects of moral causes are attributed to government. If a people are become luxurious, debauched and miserable, it is solely owing to its government! The influence of climate, of situation, of commerce, and even of education, are not thought very material, and many of the clear and masterly principles of the illustrious Montesquieu are made to give way to the feeble and partial conjectures of some modern philosophers (p. 20).

His own remedy would be education—not as it stands at present, languishing yet feverish with superstition and priestcraft, but founded on a broad, practical, *English* basis. Williams was more successful than Priestley in anticipating, if he did not actually prescribe, the lines along which middle-class education was destined to develop.

The intellectual awakening of the middle class was the direct result of the corruption—real or imaginary—of the upper. And it was Montesquieu who had first, in the most famous sentence in his book, goaded it into activity by predicting that England would perish 'lorsque la puissance législative sera plus corrompue que l'exécutrice' (*E.L.* xi, 6). The middle class represented the legislative, and rightly conceived that the future of England was in its hands.

National education. Montesquieu's correlation of education with government naturally lent itself as an argument in favour of a national system of education. But the fact that he was also widely quoted by the opponents of national education is proof enough that he was in reality no advocate of a time-serving pedagogy.

¹ In one sense Priestley was not the first in this field. It is well worth remembering that as early as 1753 Blackstone, the famous author of the *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, was professing at Oxford a popular course of lectures on the spirit and principles of the English law and constitution, addressed not to specialists but to a general cultured public. The whole basis of Blackstone's theory of the English constitution, as well as a mass of legal theory embodied in the *Commentaries*, has been taken almost bodily out

of the *Esprit des Lois*. Thus for many years, both as lecturer and as first Vinerian professor at Oxford, Blackstone poured out to generations of students a flood of constitutional theory first evolved by Montesquieu.

² David Williams is best known to fame as the founder of the Royal Literary Fund for Distressed Authors (1788). He was also honoured with the title of citizen of France under the Revolution. His contribution to educational theory is entitled *Treatise of Education* (London, Payne, 1774, 8°).

The cause of national education had no stauncher champion than Dr John Brown, already referred to as the author of the *Estimate of the Manners and Customs of the Times*, a book which enjoyed a prodigious circulation in the 1750's. Brown's *idée fixe* was that England was being corrupted by luxury, effeminacy, and like vices; and from the very frequent recourse he has to Montesquieu it is not unfair to say that his thought was largely inspired by him. In a later work—*Thoughts on Civil Liberty* (1765)—Brown put the case for national education, which he plainly adopted from *L'Esprit des Lois*, xix, on 'L'Esprit Général...d'une Nation'. His argument is roughly this: the characteristic diseases of our body social, the corrupt manners and principles that threaten the life of the state, are faction and licence; faction commonly arises amongst the uneducated poor, and licence amongst the idle rich (p. 110). But we have it on the authority of Montesquieu that the conservation of a free constitution depends upon the soundness of the manners and principles of the people (p. 67). The most effective way, therefore, of stamping out the two evils of faction and licence is by 'a general and prescribed improvement of the laws of education' (p. 156). We, in Britain, need 'a prescribed Code of Education, to which all the members of the community should legally submit'. This code Dr Brown drew up in a later publication.¹

But Priestley, in no way intimidated by Brown's stately periods, capital letters, italics and wide sweeping margins, denied that a national education was a proper—even if it were an effective—means of suppressing faction. 'I should object', says he, 'to the interference of the legislature in this business of education as prejudicial to the proper design of education, and also to the great ends of civil societies with respect to their present utility; but, more especially, as tending to interrupt their progress to a state of greater perfection than they have yet attained.'² A national education would tend to perpetuate existing evils, would subvert the constitution, and usher in despotism. Moreover, religion, and consequently education which should always be founded upon it, lay outside the scope and competence of the civil magistrate.

David Williams was also actively opposed to national education on the same grounds as Priestley, viz. that an education under state control would be a positive danger to the state, owing to its probable misuse as an agent and support of existing government. His *Lectures on Political Principles* (1789) take—in part—the form of an attack on his former idol, Montesquieu, and more especially on his supposed educational theories. His general indictment of the system is that, instead of having the health, knowledge and virtue of individuals as its objects, and qualifying them to have judgment and will in the parts they are designed to act, it would be a mere 'instrument of power to construct them into forms and to insert them in imperfect, useless or mischievous institutions'.³ In extenuation of this *volte-face*—indeed, this deliberate misinterpretation of Montesquieu's real views—it must be observed that Williams is here indulging in an 'academic exercise' to stimulate argument among his pupils.⁴

But indeed, neither side understood him well: the Brownites quoted his authority

¹ See appendix to a *Sermon on the Female Character and Education* of 16 May 1765.

² J. Priestley, *Essay on a Course of Liberal Education*, pp. 142-3.

³ This was the stock argument against national education. Godwin puts it thus: 'The project of a national education ought uniformly to be discouraged on account of its obvious alliance with national government.... Government will not fail

to employ it to strengthen its ends and perpetuate its institutions' (*Pol. Just.* II, 670-1, 1793 edition).

⁴ 'I presume to contend with Montesquieu,' he says (p. 52), 'for your encouragement, not my own gratification. I have no objection to the triumph of his advocates, if it be effected by argument and eloquence.'

for the necessary relation between education and form of government; their opponents cited him as the advocate of personal liberty and the free evolution of institutions. His true doctrine is that in free countries constitutions and manners should, and do, evolve freely and harmoniously. Each sphere of activity being to some extent independent, each is sure to be mildly progressive and aggressive and so keep the machinery of state in onward motion; law and education, for instance, by 'opposing the vices inherent in the climate of a country', prevent the powerful physical forces in a state from becoming despotic.

Events have proved that Priestley's, Godwin's and Williams's fears were unfounded, but they have not vindicated Brown. If in 1870 and 1891 government conferred the privileges of first a national, then a free education, upon all Englishmen, it was not in order to maintain itself, but in response to a new sense of the community's duty towards its poorer members. The extension of the franchise, and the desire of existing government to secure votes may, however, be taken as secondary contributing factors.

Practical attempts at reform. Among those writers who endeavoured to translate their theories into practice, the name of Thomas Sheridan, M.A., must stand very high. Now more renowned for the progeny of his body than for that of his mind,¹ Sheridan was for a time the stormy petrel of education in England, Ireland and Scotland. His book, *British Education, or the Sources of the Disorders of Gt. Britain* (London, Dodsley, 1756), has for its thesis the basing of all education upon the English language, and more especially upon spoken English. His arguments are drawn very largely from *L'Esprit des Lois*.

The laws of education are the first impressions we receive; and as they prepare us for civil life, each particular family ought to be governed pursuant to the plan of the great family which comprehends them all. If the people in general have a principle, their constituent parts, that is, the several families, will have one also. (Cf. *E.L.* iv, 1.)

Education should therefore be adapted to the end of the particular type of government, and the *principle* of that government should be strongly inculcated in the mind of youth. Enquiring what precisely the English type of government is, he discovers that it corresponds to none of those enumerated by Montesquieu, and deduces that none of their principles—honour, virtue, fear—taken alone can apply to it (Chaps. 4 and 5). He is therefore driven back to the general principle Montesquieu had indicated as more fundamental than all others—religion.

To the great power and energy of this principle (he declares) Montesquieu has borne testimony.... He says... 'The principles of Christianity deeply engraved on the heart, would be infinitely more powerful than the false honour of monarchies, than the humane virtue of republics, or the servile fear of despotic states'.²

The primary object of our education should therefore be religion.

Of Montesquieu's other principles, that best adapted to England is virtue, because our government 'partakes more of the republican than any other form'

¹ He was the father of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and himself an actor of some repute. We find him acting in the Smock Alley Theatre about 1743, and actor-manager in 1745. Burke was acquainted with him in Ireland, and may have written for him in 1747 a play which he declined. Garrick acted with him (A. P. I. Samuels, *Early Life of Burke*, pp. 113-14).

² Sheridan shrewdly conjectures that Montesquieu said nothing about religion as the ulti-

mate basis of British liberty and the constitution because it would have meant glorifying a reformed religion, 'a point of too much danger for a subject of France and a Roman Catholic by profession, to meddle with' (p. 43). He regards this as proved by the fact that Montesquieu intentionally dissimulated the remark quoted in the text in an obscure chapter entitled 'Another of Mr Bayle's paradoxes'.

(p. 45). Rome and Greece sustained and encouraged that principle by making Rhetoric or Oratory in their own languages the chief end of education. It behoves England to do likewise. The neglect of English, Mr Sheridan claims, has been responsible for the decay of religion and art, the instability of government, the corruption of manners, and the multitude of suicides (p. 527).

Of Sheridan's experiments in educational reform little can be said. In 1757 he founded the Hibernian Society in Dublin and set on foot projects for founding schools designed to form 'good men and good Christians' and to 'adapt the whole of education to the British Constitution'. The scheme was widely advertised, but financial support was lacking and it came to little or nothing. At Edinburgh in 1761 he founded a similar society called the Select Society for promoting the reading and speaking of the English language in Scotland. The new society had a highly distinguished directorate, including many nobles and the flower of the University.¹ It proposed to open schools in Edinburgh with English staffs, and its object was to eradicate the Scottish accent from the speech of the young. There appears, indeed, to have been a fairly general desire even amongst Scottish scholars and writers at this time to purge of Scotticisms their spoken and written styles. James Burnet (Lord Monboddo) and Horne Tooke (in *Diversions of Purley*) strongly emphasize the need of acquiring a pure English style and accent; and it will be recalled that David Hume made a list of his own Scotticisms in order to avoid the use of them. Other Scottish writers, William Robertson the historian, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, etc., also deliberately imitated French models, including Montesquieu. The fundamental principles of the Scottish scheme were naturally identical with those of the Irish one, and aimed exclusively at communal utilitarianism in its narrowest political sense. In spite of the first leaping flame of enthusiasm that Sheridan kindled in Scotland,² the Edinburgh Society appears to have had as little future as the Irish; and its founder, now somewhat embittered and disillusioned, began to complain of neglect. As a sop to his disappointed vanity, and doubtless in recognition of his praiseworthy efforts in the cause of English Toryism, the king, George III,³ granted him in 1762 a pension of £200 a year. Sheridan thereupon renewed his endeavours and in 1769 published *A Plan of Education for the Young Nobility and Gentry of Great Britain* (London, Dilly), dedicated and lengthily addressed to the royal patron. The tendency of this book is naturally similar to his former book on *British Education*, except that here—as befits such an enlightened public as the one now aimed at—the article of religion is very definitely subordinated to that of English oratory.⁴ We scarcely need to be reminded of the wonderful development of political oratory at this time, and the readiness of such men as Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Burke and R. B. Sheridan to place their genius at the service of the state. Indeed, there is a very important correlation between state utilitarianism and the flourishing of political rhetoric. In this new *Plan*, Sheridan once more stresses the public aspect of educa-

¹ For some details of this Society, see the *Scots Magazine* for July and August 1761, and *The Library* for December 1761.

² Dr Thos. Somerville gives an excellent account of the effect of Sheridan's lectures in Edinburgh, in *My Own Life and Times, 1714-1814*, pp. 56-7. They gave, he says, 'a new direction to the pursuits of students'. 'Since this time, correct pronunciation and elegant reading have, in Edinburgh, been reckoned indispensable acquirements for people of fashion and for public speakers.'

³ George III, who came to the throne in 1760, piqued himself on being British to the backbone, and for a time, at least, commended himself to public opinion by supporting anything that had a distinctively pro-British tendency.

⁴ In the Irish version of his scheme, Sheridan had cleverly stressed the religious side. But then, Ireland was Catholic, and loved England no more then than she does now.

tion, since 'Montesquieu', says he, 'has unquestionably shewn that no government can long subsist if the education of the youth be not suited to its principle' (p. 34).

But from an *Examen of Mr. Sheridan's Plan for the Improvement of Education in this country* by a set of gentlemen associated for this purpose (London, 1784), it is clear that by 1784 nothing tangible had been done to put his theories into effect. Moreover, by this time Rousseau had boldly asserted the dignity and importance of the individual, and the 'good citizen' ideal in education had suffered a setback from which it has never recovered.

Military education. Nearly all educational theory in England deriving wholly or in part from Montesquieu stresses the subordination of education to the good of the State. It is therefore not surprising to find military education insisted upon as a vital element in the training of the 'good citizen', whose aim and end it should be to serve the nation. Sheridan had included it in his *Plan*, but naturally it is not the central feature of it. One of the most eloquent apologists and practitioners of military education was Lewis Lochée, an avowed disciple of Montesquieu. Lochée, a Belgian soldier settled in England,¹ was the founder of a very flourishing military academy at Little Chelsea, and the author of *An Essay on Military Education* (London, 1773). His authority throughout is Montesquieu, from whose principles, he claims, it follows inescapably that military education is vital in a monarchy. He freely translates him thus. 'There is nothing that honour more strongly recommends to the nobility than to serve their prince in a military capacity (lit. *à la guerre*). And indeed, this is their favourite profession, because its dangers, its success, and even its miscarriages are the road to grandeur' (cf. *Esprit des Lois*, iv, 2). The march of his argument can almost be foreseen. From Montesquieu's grouping of governments and their principles (of which Lochée gives a full account) it is clear that the whole tendency of English education should be towards 'honour'. This principle, we are informed on Montesquieu's authority, 'estimates the actions of men not as good, but as splendid; not as just, but as great; not as reasonable, but as extraordinary' (*E.L.* iv, 2). It abstracts conduct from its moral context, and places it in a context of romance and colour. The logical depositary of this code of false honour is plainly an academy of military education; and Lochée asks us to believe that it is out of pure disinterested love of truth and the British people (to whom he is under 'peculiar obligations') that he has founded his school at Little Chelsea. Lochée's further debt to Montesquieu is too voluminous to be set out in detail. His system was much appreciated and met with great success.² Another weighty advocate of military education—and even of war—was Adam Smith.³ He, too, was a careful student of Montesquieu, though he makes no direct use of him in this particular connexion. But the writers in support of similar doctrines were numerous and influential, and an interesting study might be made of such polemical works as Dr Geo. Chapman's *Treatise on Education* (London, Cadell, 1773) and the many pamphlets of the time upon the same subject.

Conclusion. From this very cursory survey of Montesquieu's influence on educational theory and practice in England, it is clear that he was taken for the most part as the champion of an education designed to fit the individual into the

¹ Lochée became a colonel in the Légion belge, but resigned after a dispute with General Schonfeld.

² See, for example, *Observations on Education in general, but particularly on Naval Education*, by J. Bettsworth and H. Fox (London, Hesse,

1782), p. 17. '...For his services to the public, he has been distinguished by the royal approbation and reward.'

³ *Wealth of Nations*, Bk. v, ch. i, part 3, art. 2, 'On the Education of Youth'.

political and social environment in which he was destined to pass his life. This was understood to be a *national* education which should subordinate the interests of the individual to the state; which should have English culture instead of the classics as its basis, and which should include our national institutions as an important feature of its curriculum. It should place honour before life, and hence should include instruction in military matters. It is, however, only fair to Montesquieu to repeat once more that what, in the *Esprit des Lois*, was merely observation and description, was understood as doctrine by the majority of his English interpreters. 'On dit ici ce qui est et non pas ce qui doit être, *l'honneur est un préjugé que la religion travaille tantôt à détruire, tantôt à régler.*' For him religion, in its broadest sense, represented the ultimate truths or values.

Aujourd'hui (he says elsewhere) nous recevons trois éducations différentes ou contraires; celle de nos pères, celle de nos maîtres, celle du monde. Ce qu'on nous dit dans la dernière renverse toutes les idées des premières. Cela vient, en quelque partie, du contraste qu'il y a parmi nous entre les engagements de la religion et ceux du monde.

Here, as in his remarks on 'false honour' and the false values in general which govern civilized societies, it is not difficult to perceive a note of bitterness. Not religious in the ordinary sense of the word, Montesquieu was yet clearly conscious of the existence of transcendental values and powers such as form part of the subject-matter of all true religion. Hence, doubtless, his frequent appeal to universals, and his occasional appeal to the Christian religion as the official, though corrupt, guardian of them. Seen in the general context of his philosophy, Montesquieu's remarks on education merely serve to emphasize his general dissatisfaction with the present constitution of society. It is undoubtedly in so far as educational reformers in England sought to create a competent and well-informed administrative class on the one hand, and on the other to spread enlightenment through the poor and ignorant masses of the nation, that they truly interpreted the spirit of Montesquieu's teaching. Writing of the Corresponding Societies of the pre-Reform days around 1800, Robert Birley says: 'It must not be forgotten that their methods were educative. Education, through the writings of Montesquieu and Condorcet, and later of Godwin, was looked upon as a universal talisman.' Surely the fact that Montesquieu was himself taken as the subject-matter for the education of the ignorant and unfranchised poor is sufficient indication of where his real influence lay, and testimony enough to the deep and far-reaching consequences of that influence.

F. T. H. FLETCHER

LIVERPOOL

THE MARRANO PRESS AT FERRARA, 1552-1555

A curious by-way of Spanish and Portuguese bibliography lies in the literature published throughout Europe, in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, for the use of Marranos who had returned to the faith of their fathers but were as yet inept in Hebrew. A fair amount has been written about this,¹ but some details are still obscure. In particular, much remains to be settled regarding the cradle of Marrano book production—the printing press which flourished at Ferrara in the sixth decade of the sixteenth century, and is of considerable importance in the annals of not only Jewish literature but also that of Spain and Portugal in general.²

It is sometimes stated that the founder of this press was Abraham Usque. This is incorrect. Hebrew printing had begun at Ferrara as early as 1477, and a new press was set up there by a certain Solomon Zarfati in 1551. But Ferrara contained at that time, besides the old-established native Jewish community, a large body of ex-Marranos from Spain and Portugal, attracted thither by the liberal policy of the House of Este.³ Among them was a certain Yomtob ben Levi Athias, a Spaniard, who had been known in his Christian days as Jeronimo de Vargas,⁴ and was perhaps identical with the 'Rabbi Yomtob' who acted as intermediary for a group settlement about this time.⁵ Realizing that the section to which he belonged (to many of whom Hebrew was inaccessible) needed literature for their own requirements, he set up his own press for the purpose. Here he published in 1552-3, so far as is known, four books—the last of them in conjunction with Abraham Usque, who then took the work over and produced in 1553-5 six more. Of the total of ten volumes, seven were liturgical and Biblical translations in Spanish; one was an original work of Jewish interest in Portuguese; and the remaining two were secular works, one in either language. It may be added that all are of the utmost rarity to-day, one of them being known only from secondary references.

All the productions of this press (except for some title-pages) are in Gothic characters. The letters have a somewhat Spanish form, and it is by no means unlikely that the matrices were imported from the Peninsula. In any case, the use of this type betrays an Iberian influence. In Italy, by now, the roman and italic had gained the day. In Spain they were indeed beginning to make headway,

¹ The classical works are Kayserling's superb but woefully inaccurate *Biblioteca española-portuguesa-judaica* (Strasbourg, 1890) and his *Sephardim* (Leipzig, 1859); recently, M. B. Amzalak, of Lisbon, and J. S. da Silva Rosa, of Amsterdam, have made important contributions to the subject. There is a popular résumé in my *History of the Marranos* (2nd ed. Philadelphia, 1941; Spanish translation, Buenos Aires, 1941), chapter xiii.

² The only comprehensive treatment of the subject hitherto is in De' Rossi's still useful *De typographia hebraeo-ferrariensi* (Parma, 1780), in which an entire chapter is devoted to the Spanish and Portuguese productions of this press. There are also details regarding individual volumes in the following works, which will be referred to in the course of this paper: J. S. da Silva Rosa, *Die spanischen und portugiesischen*

gedruckten Judaica in der Bibliothek... 'Ets Ham' (Amsterdam, 1933); S. Seelgman, *Bibliographie en Histoire* (Amsterdam, 1927); E. Toda, *Bibliografia spagnola d'Italia* (5 vols 1927 ff.); J. Zedner, *Catalogue of Hebrew Books in the British Museum* (London, 1867); J. C. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea* (4 vols., Hamburg, 1715-33).

³ Cf. A. Balletti, *Gli ebrei e gli estensi* (2nd ed. Reggio Emilia, 1930), chapters iv and xvi; and my articles, 'A Marrano Martyr at Rome' in *Festschrift zu Simon Dubnow* (Berlin, 1930), pp. 180-6 and 'I Marrani in Italia. nuovi documenti' in *Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, vii, 419-43.

⁴ The identification results from the names given in the parallel passages in the Preface and Colophon to the 'Jewish' and 'Christian' editions of the Ferrara Bible of 1553: see below.

⁵ Balletti, op. cit. p. 78 n.

but the old style was still solidly established, especially for works of a theological nature. The refugees in Ferrara were at some pains to uphold in this respect the tradition of their native land, even when strictly secular work was concerned.

It was, according to the accepted account, with the establishment of this press in 1552 that there were published the earliest specimens of Spanish printing (and indeed of vernacular printing in Latin characters in any language) for Jewish use: and Ferrara is always associated with the innovation. But it is by no means certain that this claim is justified. There is extant a Spanish translation of the Penitential prayers, produced in Venice by the house of Bragadini in the same year (*Celihat... de los quarenta dias ante del dia de Quipur*);¹ and it is possible that this has the priority over the first Ferrara book. Apart from this, we have reason to believe that there were yet earlier publications, of which no copies have survived. On the title-page of the Spanish daily prayer-book of Ferrara of 1552—the first product of this press—it is indicated that the translation was a literal one, from ancient copies, and was published, with additions, ‘por quanto los ympresos hasta à qui estan errados.’ From this it seems clear that there was more than one prior edition, no trace of which remains.

The phrase ‘traduzydo del Hebrayco de verbo à verbo, de antiguos exemplares’ is also significant. It suggests that the Ferrara editions of the prayer-book in Spanish (which served as the basis for those published in Amsterdam, London, etc., in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) did not represent a *new* version, or a version, but *the* version traditional among Spanish Jews of a former generation, no doubt employed in education and used by the women; the prayer-book version, in fact, which corresponds to the Biblical version represented in the Ferrara Bible. That Spanish translations of the Hebrew liturgy existed before the Expulsion of 1492 is indeed certain. There is in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America a fragment of a MS. prayer-book in Spanish in Latin characters, belonging to the fifteenth century.² Another specimen of the period was published by Fidel Fita;³ yet another is preserved in the dossier of an Inquisitional case from Toledo.⁴ The ‘beata’ Mencia Suares, tried by the Holy Office in 1488, likewise possessed a prayer-book in Spanish, though from the fragment published it seems that the contents bore little relation to the Hebrew liturgy.⁵ A further Jewish prayer-book, *Cituri* (i.e. Sidur: Hebrew סידור) *de oraciones*, written in romance, is referred to in Spain before the end of the fifteenth century in connexion with the trial of a daughter of Juan de Lucena, who is revealed by these records as the earliest Spanish printer,⁶ and whose interests should logically have been stronger in the vernacular than in Hebrew. Other Inquisitional processes of the same period point to the existence of Spanish devotional works for Marrano use.⁷ There is no *a priori* reason therefore to doubt that there were printed versions of the Jewish

¹ I know of only the British Museum copy of this work (Zedner, p. 492; Toda, § 1084): unfortunately, it is at present (October 1942) inaccessible, and I do not know whether the colophon gives any additional details. The importance attached to this formulary (printed also at Ferrara during the same year) is easily to be understood: repentant Marranos felt a special appeal in prayers of contrition.

² D. S. Blondheim, *Les Parlers judéo-romans* (Paris, 1925), p. 134.

³ *España Hebrea*, II (Madrid, 1898), 108-12.

⁴ *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XXIII, 323-6.

⁵ F. Baer, *Die Juden im christlichen Spanien*, II (Berlin, 1936), 479 f.

⁶ M. Serrano y Sanz, ‘Fernando de Rojas’ in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 1902 (offprint), pp. 41-2.

⁷ Baer, pp. 419, 445, 478, 479, 545. Note especially the title *cidur de todo el anno* on p. 479, which seems to link up with the Ferrara *Libro de oraciones de todo el año* and *Sedur de oraciones* of 1552—the exact title of the work which Juan de Lucena’s daughter is said to have owned seventy years earlier.

liturgy going back well beyond the earliest now extant—at least, that is, to the first half of the sixteenth century. That none have survived to our own day (so far as is known) may be attributed in part to the heavy wear undergone in particular by prayer-books, which in some cases have been literally thumbed out of existence, and in part, in sixteenth-century Italy, to the intermittent attentions of the Inquisition. The mere fact that some of the productions of the Ferrara press in Spanish and Portuguese are so prodigiously rare supports the hypothesis that some anterior publications may have entirely disappeared.

Nevertheless, even if Yomtob Athias was not the first printer of Spanish books for Jewish use, he was certainly the printer of the earliest that have survived (with the single possible exception—Venice 1552—that has been mentioned). His productions comprise the following:

Lybro de Oracyones de todo el año, traduzzydo del Hebrayco de verbo à verbo, de antiguos exemplares, por quanto los ympresos hasta à qui estan errados, con muchas cosas acrescentadas de nuevo segun por la siguiente tabla se muestra. (Svo.) Dated 14th Sivan 5312=6th June 1552. (Kayserling, p. 59; Toda, § 2758; Zedner, p. 485.)¹

Sedur de Oraciones de mes con mucha diligencia visto y enmendado... ympresso por yndustria y depesa de Yom Tob Athias hyo de Levi Athias, en el mes de Sivan de 5312. (252 ll., 24mo.) (Silva Rosa, § 45.)

Orden de Silhoth el qual comença en la luna nueva de Elul que responde a Agosto y dura fasta Kipur q̄ son quarenta noches de contricion. (56 ll., 24mo.) (Silva Rosa, § 69.)

The small format of these works is noteworthy. Added to the fact that in the third the date for the recital of the prayers in question is carefully given according to the secular calendar (which was assuredly unnecessary for any persons living in a Jewish environment), this makes one wonder whether they were perhaps produced for secret export to the Peninsula for Marrano use.

These preliminary publications were followed by the most famous and most important production of the Ferrara press, the great Spanish Bible of 1553—the first, incidentally, in connexion with which the name of Abraham Usque makes its appearance.

Biblia en lengua española traduzida palabra por palabra dela verdad Hebrayca por muy excelentes letrados, vista y examinada por el oficio dela inquisicion. (Folio, 16 ff. + 400 ll. + 3 ll.) (Kayserling, p. 28; Toda, § 689; Rossi, pp. 64–7, 107, etc.)

The Ferrara Bible was published (as is well known) in two forms, one the 'Jewish' and one the 'Christian'. The most striking and obvious differences between the two are at the beginning and the end. Both forms, according to the title-page, were 'seen and examined by the Office of the Inquisition', and both appeared 'con privilegio del ylusterrissimo Señor Duque de Ferrara'. The dedication following this, and the colophon at the close of the volume, are, however, strikingly different in the two issues. The one edition is dedicated to the Duke of Ferrara, the other to Doña Gracia Nassi (better known as Gracia Mendes), the former Marrano who was now living in that place, the most adored Jewish woman of her day. The colophon states, in the one case, that the work was edited 'con yndustria y diligencia de Duarte Pinel, Portuguez', and printed at Ferrara 'a costa y despeza de Jeronimo de Vargas, Español', on 1 March 1553; in the other, the names 'Abrahã Usque' and 'Yom Tob Athias, hijo de Levi Athias', and the Hebrew date 14 Adar 5313, are substituted. Clearly, the one was intended for Jews, and the other for Christians.

¹ Rossi, p. 62, ascribes this work to Usque, but he had never seen it: cf. the details given by S. Seehgman, op. cit. pp. 33 ff.

The text of the two issues is identical, with the exception of the famous passage which will be mentioned below. The editorial boast on the title-page that it was 'translated from the Hebrew verity by several excellent scholars' and in the 'address to the reader that they had caused it to be made by 'several learned men', is to say the least an exaggeration. It is, in fact, the traditional version current among the Spanish Jews, already printed so far as the Pentateuch was concerned in Hebrew characters six years earlier, in 1547, in the Constantinople Polyglot, and perhaps going back (as the late D. S. Blondheim has shown) to a late Latin prototype; though of course a number of stylistic modifications were embodied in order to make the version run more easily.¹ A typographical curiosity is that in the original issue, owing to a printer's error, several verses (Leviticus vii, 36-viii, 7a) are omitted between folios 48 and 49. Later, this mistake was discovered, and a cancel including the missing verses was set up to replace f. 49.

In this, there can be no question of theological sensitiveness. There are, however, two traditional differences between the 'Jewish' and 'Christian' issues. One is, that in the former there is inserted at the end (before the final leaf containing the register and imprint) two leaves with a table of the Prophetical Lessons according to the Jewish practice, week by week (*Tabla de las Haphtaroth de todo el año*). In fact, this is very seldom met with in any copies, and is to be found sometimes in 'Christian' ones. This variation can be explained without great difficulty—the leaf may have disappeared in many cases through wear, or may sometimes have been inserted by request in copies of the 'Christian' issue. Far more remarkable is the variation in the famous verse of Isaiah (chapter vii, verse 14), which constituted one of the great points of dispute between Jews and Christians at the time, best translated, 'Behold, a maid shall conceive and bear a son'. It is generally stated that, in the issue intended for Jews, the word for maid is rendered *moça*, and in that intended for Christians *virgen*. In fact, there are three renderings of the term: *virgen*, *moça*, and finally *alma*—a transliteration of the original Hebrew word, and as it were a compromise. Of the five copies of the work in the British Museum, three have the dedication in the 'Christian' form (one of them having Leviticus vii, 36-viii, 7a in the revised version); but all these render the debated word by the curious neutral form, *alma*. Two of the British Museum copies have the dedication in the 'Jewish' form; of these, one indeed renders the debated term *moça*, but the other—amazingly—*virgen*. There are two Bodleian copies, one 'Jewish' and one 'Christian'. Though typographically different, both omit Leviticus vii, 36-viii, 7a, and therefore neither appears to be a revised impression: but both have the reading *alma*. Again in the 'Christian' copy formerly in the library of Lord Crawford, *moça* figures, which is supposed to represent the taste of the Jews. The result is bewildering to the bibliographer. It looks as though the editors began by using the term *moça*, as in the old Jewish version; were reminded of, or realized, the fact that this was dangerous in a Catholic country and might be considered heretical; and altered it first to *virgen*, and then to the non-committal *alma* (unless the order of the last two processes is to be reversed), these sheets being bound up indiscriminately in the two editions. The only thing that it seems possible to state dogmatically is that the traditional account, that *moça* figures in the 'Jewish'

¹ The text is analysed superficially from the philological point of view (and on the basis of a later edition) by M. Wiener in *Modern Language Notes*, x, 81-5; xi, 24-42, 84-105. Rossi's description is not entirely superseded. See also S. Berger, 'Les Bibles castillanes et portugaises',

in *Romania*, xxviii, 360-408, 508-67 (especially pp. 536-42) and R. Galdós, 'La traducción hebreo-castellana del libro de Isaías en la Biblia Ferrarense y en la de la Casa de Alba', in *Estudios Ecclesiásticos*, April 1926.

version and *virgen* in the 'Christian' one, cannot be maintained. It should be added that the use of the non-Spanish word *alma* in the translation of this verse seems to have been traditional in Spain, figuring (though only as an afterthought¹) in the Alba Bible as well as in a manuscript of the Academia de la Historia.¹

Athias's collaborator in the production of the Ferrara Bible, and ultimate successor in his printing activities, bore a name which was notable in the history of Spanish and Portuguese typography and literature in Italy. We know of three persons called Usque who flourished contemporaneously in Ferrara. There was Samuel Usque, author of *Consolaçam às Tribulaçoens de Israel*, a classic of sixteenth-century Portuguese literature as well as of Jewish historiography; Salamon Usque, translator of Petrarch into Spanish and a fairly capable versifier in Italian as well, and finally the printer Abraham Usque.² Much has been written about them and their productions hitherto, but there has been a considerable amount of confusion and some notable omissions.

It is necessary to determine in the first place what was the relationship between the three. It is generally stated that Abraham Usque and Samuel Usque were brothers. This is, however, based on conjecture; and the conjecture is almost certainly unjustified. On the title-page to the original edition of the *Consolaçam*, the author's name is given as Samuel Usque, and the printer's as Abraham aben Usque. The change is not very significant, but it is difficult to imagine that if the two had been brothers they would have given their names in different forms on the same page. On the other hand, it seems that the litterateur Salamon Usque was Abraham's son. It is known that the printer had a son, Salomon, who assisted him in his printing work. A Salomon Usque makes a fleeting appearance as a patron of Hebrew printing in Constantinople in 1561, and we find Salamon Usque the poet established in this city subsequently.³ The equation of the two does not seem to be open to doubt. It was long believed that he was known in Christian circles as Duarte Gomez, being identical with the Marrano business man and poet of that name, verses by whom figure in certain miscellaneous volumes of the period. This theory however is without foundation.

In contradistinction to his associate Yomtob Athias, Abraham Usque called himself a Portuguese, and was presumably born in that country after the Forced Conversion of 1497, as a Marrano. The name Usque derives from Huesca (the ancient Osca) in Spain, and it is to be imagined that his progenitors came thence in consequence of the Expulsion of 1492. According to one note, however, the family originated immediately from Zamora in Castile. We are informed that his father's name was Salamon, the printer-poet Salamon Usque being named after him. From the Ferrara Bible, we know that Abraham Usque's name, as a Marrano, had been Duarte Pinhel. He is generally assumed to be identical with the author of the following volume:

Eduardi Pinelli Lusitani Latinae grammatice compendium. Tractatus de calendis... Ulssipone, apud Ludov. Rhoterigr. 1543.

It may be pointed out incidentally that the latter part of this work is a treatise

¹ Berger, pp. 531-5. There is no early printed version of Isaiah in Judaeo-Spanish, but the 1832 edition (based on traditional elements) reads 'He la moça ençentada y parirà'. It is interesting to note that this passage engaged the attention of Spanish polemicists as early as Isidore of Seville.

² See my article, 'Salusque Lusitano and

Duarte Gomez', to be published shortly in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, where many details of the accounts now current are corrected.

³ See his verses in H. G. Rosedale, *Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company* (London, 1904), p. 33 and Plate XVII: the author's name is given as 'Salamone Usche hebreo'.

on the Roman Calends, not (as is generally stated) on the Calendar. The fact that the author displays so high a degree of general culture may be taken as further evidence that he was brought up as a Christian—born, that is, after, or at least not long before, the General Conversion.

It cannot have been long after the publication of this work that the author followed the example of so many other Portuguese crypto-Jews at this period (the Inquisition was instituted in Portugal in 1536, the first *auto* took place in 1540, and the last moderating influences were removed in 1547) and fled for safety overseas. He made his way to Italy, and settled in Ferrara—then a great centre of Marrano immigration. (Unfortunately, in the considerable mass of material regarding the Marranos in this place, both in the Italian and in the Portuguese archives, no trace of him has thus far been found.) Discarding his baptismal name, he henceforth called himself by the ancestral name, Abraham ben Salomon Usque (or, as he sometimes termed it, Aben Usque),¹ to which he frequently added the nostalgic epithet, 'Portuguese', showing his profound love of the country which he had been forced to leave. Hebrew printing had already been going on at Ferrara for some while, as has been mentioned, and it was to this that Usque devoted his interests, taking over the types formerly owned by Samuel Zarfati. In the summer of 1553 (9 Ellul 5313), the first Hebrew book (*Seder Hoshanot*) appeared at his press. During this same year, Usque was engaged in his work as editor of the great Spanish Bible in conjunction with Yomtob Athias, the printer. Once this had appeared, he took over the other's European types and his vernacular interests, and the works which were subsequently published at Ferrara in Spanish and Portuguese appeared under his sole imprint. It is not improbable that Athias (who had probably been born before the expulsion from Spain in 1492) had by now died.

In almost all his work, whether Hebrew, Spanish or Portuguese, Abraham Usque employed his familiar printer's mark, consisting of an armillary sphere. This was copied from the symbol adopted by the kings of his native Portugal, which figures on the title-pages of many works printed there at this time. Originally, there was to be read in a scroll below the sphere (*sphera*) the punning Biblical motto 'Spera in Deo et fac bonitatem' (Psalm xxxvii, 3, vulgate version). This, however, is a mistranslation: the original Hebrew (correctly rendered in the English versions) reads not 'Hope', but 'Trust in the Lord'. This is the reason presumably for Usque's somewhat clumsy alterations. In the Hebrew works produced by him, he obscures the point of his model, replacing this verse by another one in the original, either from the Psalms (cxxx, 5): 'I wait (lit. hope) for the Lord, my soul doth wait, and in his word do I hope', or Isaiah (xl, 31): 'They that wait (lit. hope) on the Lord shall renew their strength.' But even in the works printed in Spanish and Portuguese, the original significance disappears in Usque's rendering, the motto chosen to go with the *sphera* being 'In te, Domine, spes mea' (Psalm lxxi, 5). It is to be noted that the sphere is to be seen, on a small scale, on the mast of a shipwrecked vessel which is the salient point in the decoration of the title-page of the Ferrara Bible, and is presumably intended to illustrate the story of Jonah (whose miraculous deliverance was not without its significance to victims of the Inquisition). It is difficult to tell whether the insertion of this feature was accidental, or was intended to symbolize the Athias-Usque collaboration.

Some six months after the production of the Ferrara Bible, on 25 August 1553,

¹ Unless this name is a pure affectation, or the surname derives from some unsuspected Arabic root, this must be interpreted either as 'the son of — Usque' or 'the man of Usque'.

Usque, working alone, published the Order of Service for the New Year and Day of Atonement:

מזמור Orden de Roshasanah y Kipur, trasladado en Español, y de nuevo emendado por yndustria y diligencia de Abrahã Usque Bñ Selomoh Usque Portuguez, y estãmpado en su casa y a su costa. En Ferrara à 15. de Elul 5313. (262 ff., 12 mo.) (Kayserling, p. 61; Toda, § 3612; Rossi, pp. 63-4; Wolf, I, 32; III, 1201; Zedner, p. 490. There is a MS. copy in the Bodleian Library.)

This was followed before the year was over by a Psalter—the first vernacular one in any language printed for Jewish use. (It may, however, be mentioned that it had been preceded by *El Psalterio de David*, published in 1550 by Gryphius at Lyons, where there was not only a large Marrano settlement, but also a considerable group of Spanish Protestants.)¹ Kayserling (p. 30a) lists it as follows:

Psalterio de David, trasladado en español (12 mo).

It is unlikely that Kayserling saw this little work, which is of the utmost rarity, and was known to De Rossi (p. 62) and Wolf (II, 452) only from Le Long (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, p. 368). However, a later edition (Amsterdam, 1628) not only gives corroboratory evidence for the existence of the earlier one, but perhaps reproduces the exact title:

Psalterio de David in Hebrayco dicho Thehylin, trasladado con toda fieldad verbo de verbo del Hebrayco, y Repartido como se deve leer, En cada dia del mes segun uso de los Antiguos por el Señor A. Abenusque de Ferrera.

From the literary point of view, perhaps the most important work published at the Ferrara press was Samuel Usque's famous chronicle and threnody:

Consolacam as tribulacoens de Israel. Composto por Samuel Vsque. Empreesso en Ferrara en casa de Abraham aben Vsque 5313 Da criaçam a 7 de Setembro. (viii + 281 + iii ff., 8vo.) (Kayserling, p. 107b; King Manoel of Portugal, *Early Portuguese Books*, § lxxv; Rossi, pp. 64-7, 107.)

The original edition of this work is of the utmost rarity. It was indeed reprinted subsequently under the following title:

Consolacam as tribulacoens de Ysrael. Composto por Samuel Vsque. Empreesso en Ferrara en casa de Abraham aben Vsque 5313 Da criaçam. 27, de Setembro. (276 ff., 8vo.)

This edition is often catalogued as though it were the original. It is, however, a reprint, apparently dating to about 1600,² and printed in the Low Countries (probably Amsterdam), for the benefit of the Marranos who had recently begun to settle there.³ The two editions can be distinguished at a glance. The original one, like all these Ferrara prints, is in black letter (except for the title-page which is in roman and italic) and adorned with Usque's distinctive printer's mark. The reprint is throughout in roman, lacks this title-page adornment, and, incidentally, spells *Israel* with an initial Y. In the last line, moreover, there is a somewhat absurd slip. The original gives the date: *a 7 de Setembro*. But the *a* is a little indistinct, and in the reprint this is rendered 27, *de Setembro*.

About the work itself, a good deal has been written,⁴ but very much still remains to be done to determine its sources and influences. This is not the place to deal

¹ Another translation, by Juan Perez, was published at Venice in 1557 (*Psalms de David*... en casa de Pedro Daniel): but this was certainly for Christian use.

² Cf. Mendes dos Remedios's edition (Coimbra, 1906-7), p. xli.

³ Seeligman, op. cit. pp. 51-8.

⁴ See in particular the edition of Mendes dos Remedios referred to in a previous note, and the studies of J. Steinschneider in *Festschrift zum 10. Stiftungsfest des Akad. Vereins für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur an der... Univ. Berlin* (Berlin, 1893), pp. 24-77; and I. Loeb in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XVIII, 269 ff.

with the question. One point, however, may be touched upon. It is usual to identify the principal interlocutor, Ycabo, with Jacob ('Yacob': the anagram is obvious). But this is obviously insufficient. The personage who weeps over the sufferings of Israel is not unnaturally given the name Ichabod, of which *Ycabo* is a contracted form ('Ysrael em nome de Ycabo'): while *Numeo* is a slightly Iberianized form of 'Nahum', the Comforter, and *Zicareo* (Zachariah) 'remembers' the Divine consolation foretold in the Prophets. Regarding the history of the book, it may be added that it was put on the Madrid *Index librorum prohibitorum* of 1640, and that it apparently circulated in England as early as 1554. The passage of the Inquisitional Process from which we know this is particularly informative:

He remembers that about three or four years ago this confessant being in the city of Bristol, in the kingdom of England, one Simon Ruiz, a New Christian resident in London . . . sent a printed book of prophecies to Henrique Nuñez and his wife, confessant's uncle and aunt, the which book spoke of the troubles which the sons of Isaac suffered scattered over the kingdoms and cities where they wandered, but that they must not lose confidence or be discouraged, for our Lord would deliver them, and send the Messiah to them, and they must live in that hope: and confessant believed that the book was sent from Italy to those parts of England, and it was entitled 'To Beatriz de Luna, wife of Diogo Mendes'. The which book was read by the confessant once, and he accepted it all and was confirmed in his errors by the teaching of the said book and by what his uncle and aunt told him. And they read the book also, and confessant on going to London returned the said book to Simon Ruiz who had sent it, and the confessant supposes that he has it still; and it was written in Portuguese, and it was a quarto. . . . He also remembers that he, the deponent, had with him [when he returned to London] a book of prophecies of which he has spoken. . . . to give to Simon Ruiz, to whom it belonged, and while he had it in the house of the said licentiate Hector Nuñez, one of the three young men, he does not remember which of them, took away the book from the house, saying that he would read and copy it.¹

On the completion of the *Consolaçam*, Usque seems to have turned his attention to general printing. He now produced in succession two books which are of no Jewish interest whatsoever. The first was a famous work compiled about a century earlier by Alonso de la Torre:

Vysyon Delectable de la Philosophia y artes liberales A do por muy sotil artificio se declaran altos secretos. Y per fin las xxiii Coplas de don George Manrique. Estampado en Ferrara, Março 1554. (4 ff. + 171 leaves + Index + poem by Manrique, 8vo.) (Catalogue of Library of Vicente Salvá (Valencia, 1872), § 2435; Rossi, p. 67.)

Though this work (the printing of which ended on 15 March) does not apparently bear the printer's name, Rossi, who saw it in the hands of Jews at Leghorn (*apud judaeos liburnenses*), informs us that Usque's familiar badge appears at the close.²

The subsequent history of this edition is curious. It was translated into Italian, and published at Venice in 1556. This Italian edition was then translated back into Spanish by the ex-Marrano Francisco de Cáceres³ and published at Frankfort in 1623, a reissue appearing in Amsterdam under the auspices of David de Castro Tartas in 1663.⁴ It may be mentioned that the author—himself apparently a

¹ Miscellanes of the Jewish Historical Society of England, II, 47, 49. There is some obvious confusion regarding the size of the book, etc.

² I have now succeeded in tracing a copy of this work (which is not to be found even in the National Library of Spain) in private possession in Madrid. It is in gothic characters and bears on the title-page Usque's well-known sphere and motto.

³ See for him Kayserling, *Biblioteca*, p. 32. He was also author of the *Nuevos fieros españoles* (Paris, 1607), in which he is described as 'gentil-hombre castellano'; *Emblemes sur les actions . . . du seignor espagnol* (Middelpburg, 1608; Rouen, 1637) and *Dialogos satiricos* (Frankfort, 1616).

⁴ Seeligman, op. cit. p. 49.

Marrano—made considerable use of Maimonides, and was in turn utilized by Ibn Verga in his discursive Hebrew chronicle, *Shevet Jehudah*.¹

The *Vysyon Delectable* was succeeded in the same year by another literary work of general interest—in Portuguese this time, not in Spanish, and written by one of the most notable figures in contemporary Portuguese literature. This was the first edition of the famous pastoral and chivalrous romance, *Menina e Moça*—one of the most important imaginative works of the age, by Bernardim Ribeiro, ‘the father of bucolic prose and verse in Portugal’.

Hystoria de Menina y Moca, por Bernaldim Ribeyro, agora de novo estampada e com summa deligencia emendada. E assi algumas Eglogas suas com ho mais que na pagina segunthe se vera. (8vo.) (King Manuel, *Early Portuguese Books*, § xcii.)

Notwithstanding the wording of the title of this excessively rare publication—only one copy, that of the British Museum, is known to survive—this was so far as is known the first edition; the next one (a different version) being that of Evora of 1557, and the third (based on the Ferrara issue) that of Cologne, 1559. It is one of the very few Portuguese books of the sixteenth century printed outside the Peninsula. The fact that Abraham Usque interested himself in it is curious. It is known that Ribeiro was banished from the Portuguese court, in consequence of an episode of romance; and it has been conjectured that he went to Italy, where the Usques befriended him and saw to the publication of his book. But an even more remarkable hypothesis has been put forward; that he was, in fact, identical with the gifted Jewish pastoral writer, Samuel Usque, returning to Judaism under that name in his maturity. Another suggestion is that the Usques brought the work with them in manuscript when they left Lisbon, that its style influenced the pastoral dialogue which is the setting of the heart-rending *Consolaçam*, and that they published it after they heard of the author’s unhappy death in 1552.² It is indubitable in any case that they were in close relationship with the great Portuguese writer, who in his writings ‘introduced the suave pastoral style and a deep love of nature into Portuguese literature’.

The interlude as a general printer in 1554 does not appear to have been conspicuously successful. In 1555, Usque returned to his religious interests with another edition of the prayer-book, the printing of which was completed on 12 September:

Orden de oraciones de mes arreo.s. sin boltar de una a otra parte. Y la Orden de Hanucah, Purim y Pascuas de Pesah, Sebuoth y Succoth. (182 ff., 12mo.) (Kayserling, p. 59b; Rossi, pp. 67–8; Toda, § 3613; Wolf, III, 1201; Zedner, p. 485.)

With this publication, the Spanish and Portuguese press at Ferrara appears to have come to an abrupt end. The reason apparently lay in external circumstances. The counter-Reformation and the reaction against the Jews in Italy was now in full swing. In 1553, the Talmud had been burned in Rome, and in the following year a Rabbinical conference held at Ferrara had as a measure of precaution imposed a censorship on Hebrew books. The great persecution of the Marranos of

¹ F. Baer in *Tarbiz*, VI (Jerusalem, 1935), 153 ff.; and Wickersham Crawford, *The vision delectable of Alfonso de la Torre and Maimonides’ Guide of the Perplexed*, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXVIII, 188 ff.

² There is a very full account of this remarkable work from the bibliographical standpoint in King Manuel’s *Early Portuguese Books*, II, 538–49; see

also C. Michaelis de Vasconcellos, *Bernardim Ribeiro e Cristovão Falcão*, I, 40–7, 91–105. I do not know whether this and the other works treated of in this paper receive attention in G. Agnelli, *Mostra del Libro Emilianico* (c. 1930), at present inaccessible to me. The relations between Ribeiro and Usque are discussed by J. Teixeira Rego in *Estudos e Controvérsias*, 2nd series. (Oporto, 1931.)

Ancona took place in 1556, and though for the moment their position in Ferrara was safe, there was an unmistakable change of atmosphere throughout Italy. Moreover, an elegy on the Ancona martyrs, published by Abraham Usque in 1556, attracted the attention of Cardinal Ghisleri, who ordered the Duke of Ferrara to have the book burned and the author punished. Though Usque continued to publish in Hebrew for a year or so longer, until 1558, it was obvious that the old days of untrammelled freedom were over; and as a measure of precaution he seems to have abandoned his Spanish printing, intended pre-eminently for Marranos, whose relapse from Christianity it in a way encouraged and condoned.

Henceforth, the centre of production of Spanish and Portuguese books for Marrano use was Venice; the earliest work produced here (other than the isolated Bragadin *Celihat* of 1552) was *Orden de Oraciones segun el uso hebreo en lengua hebraica y vulgar española*, 'newly translated' by Dr Isaac ben Shentob Cavallero, and accompanied by the Hebrew text (sm. 8vo, c. 1580).¹ Thereafter, the stream was continuous (though never indeed very strong) throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth. A generation after the closing of the Ferrara press, moreover, a new centre opened in the Low Countries. There is evidence that a printing press had already existed here for the production of works of Jewish religious interest in Spanish; in any case, a witness who gave evidence before the Inquisition in Lisbon in 1577 testified that in Flanders he was given to read 'Jewish prayers printed there, with the title *Livros Ladinós em linghoa espanhola*'.² The title is clearly only approximate and no Flemish production of so early a date has survived. But the *Orden de Roshasanah y Kypur* published by 'Jacob Israel' in 1584, which gives Mainz (Moguntia) as the place of printing, was obviously produced for the Marranos of the Low Countries, probably at Leyden.³ Similarly, the second edition of the *Consolaçam*, in Latin characters, was almost certainly (as has been mentioned) an Amsterdam production of about 1600.

The history of the Usque family, after the closing of the Ferrara press, may be dismissed in a very few words. Of Abraham Usque nothing more is heard; he was probably some sixty years old by now, and may have died shortly after. Samuel, the author of the *Consolaçam*, emigrated to the Levant and settled in a congenial Cabbalistical environment in Safed. Salomon, Abraham's son and assistant at his printing-house, developed a considerable literary power, writing both in Spanish and in Italian. A play of his on Esther, first produced probably at Venice in 1558, is one of the earliest specimens of Jewish drama. His translation of Petrarch into Spanish, some⁴ copies of which appeared under the pseudonym Salusque Lusitano, won him a considerable reputation; and verses of his are encountered in various scattered sources. He continued moreover his father's interest in printing, and a couple of works were published in his house and under his auspices in Constantinople in 1560-1 with the old Ferrara types. Ultimately, he settled definitely in the Turkish capital, where he was a familiar figure in European mercantile and consular circles; he last makes his appearance in 1595, when he prepared for the English Ambassador a report on the political condition of Turkey, accompanied by two sonnets in Italian, which attracted a good deal of notice in London.⁵

In conclusion, it may be useful to tabulate the Spanish and Portuguese produc-

¹ No date figures in this edition, but it was included in the Madrid *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, ed. Quiruga, of 1583. There was a reprint, with an additional *declaracion de los puntos*, edited by Abraham Netto, Venice, 1622.

² A. Baião, *A Inquisição em Portugal e no Brasil* ([Lisbon], 1921), p. 205.

³ Seeligman, *op. cit.* pp. 35-8.

⁴ See my forthcoming article on Duarte Gomez and Salusque Lusitano.

⁵ *Ibid.*

tions of the Ferrara press succinctly, showing so far as is possible not only the year but the month, day and exact sequence of the production of each work:¹

YOMTOB ATHIAS

1552

- (i) Lybro de Oracyones (6 June)
- (ii) Oraciones del Mes (June)
- (iii) Orden de Silhoth

1553

- (iv) Biblia en lengua española (1 March)

ABRAHAM USQUE

- (v) Orden de Roshasanah y Kipur (26 June)
- (vi) Psalterio de David
- (vii) Consolaçam as tribulaçoens de Israel (7 September)

1554

- (viii) Vysyon Delectable (15 March)
- (ix) Menina e Moça

1555

- (x) Orden de Oraciones (12 September)

CECIL ROTH

OXFORD

¹ Copies of items i, iv, v, ix and x on my list (some of them imperfect) are in the British Museum; items ii and iii were only, so far as I know, in the Library of the Ets Haim Academy, Amsterdam; of vii there was a copy in the

collection of ex-King Manoel of Portugal (further indications in Seeligman, op. cit. pp. 57-8); of viii there is a copy in private possession in Madrid; while vii is now untraceable, being known by indirect references only.

WHO IS THE AUTHOR OF LESSING'S 'EDUCATION OF MANKIND'?

It is about a hundred years since W. Körte published his book *Albrecht Thaer. Sein Leben und Wirken als Arzt und Landwirth*, Leipzig, 1839. This work contains confessions of the later well-known founder of scientific agriculture, written by the author for his bride in 1785 when he was 33 years old. It is important to note that this was four years after Lessing's death. Körte tries to prove that the *Education of Mankind* was originally not written by Lessing but by young Thaer, he, or Leisewitz, having sent the manuscript to Lessing for the purpose of rewriting and continuation. Two years after Körte's biography of Thaer there followed G. E. Guhrauer's *Lessings Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts kritisch und philosophisch erortert. Eine Beleuchtung der Bekenntnisse in W. Körtes 'Albrecht Thaer'*, Berlin, 1841. In his justifiable dispute with Körte Guhrauer was so carried away that he claimed Thaer's confessions to be a forgery of their editor. In the second volume of Th. W. Danzel's *Lessing* (1854), which he partly edited and partly wrote, he made good these accusations. He remained convinced that Körte's assertion that Thaer was more or less the author of the *Education* was without any foundation.

In 1913, the theologian Gustav Krüger published a little book¹ in which he came to exactly the opposite conclusion, namely, that it was Lessing who could not have written the *Education*, at least not the first 53 paragraphs, while 'der zweite Teil Zusätze enthält... an denen der Verfasser des ursprünglichen Entwurfs keinen Anteil hat'. The author of the original sketch is, according to Krüger, Albrecht Thaer. We owe it to Krüger that the whole question has again been reviewed. E. Kriek and G. Fittbogen try to refute² Krüger without examining the whole Thaer question, while H. Scholz, W. v. Olshausen and W. Simons³ take sides with him. In a new biography of Thaer, Simons published for the second time those passages of Thaer which refer to Lessing, but it turns out that they differ somewhat from the form of their first publication by Körte. It is rather amusing that Simons is able to show that Körte has 'die poetischsten Stellen von Thaers Liebesbriefen wortwörtlich als seine eigene Ausdrucksweise gebracht'. After the publication of more recent books on Lessing's *Weltanschauung*, a new start was made to solve the problem. Again, Fittbogen and Krüger are the most important fighters for the causes of Lessing and Thaer respectively. Fittbogen considers⁴ the fact 'that Wagner and Leisegang recognize Lessing as sole author of the *Education*, indeed, not as a proof, but as significant', while Krüger says⁵ that 'wenn Leisegang und Wagner Lessing ohne Einschränkung als Verfasser bezeichnen, sie damit nur

¹ *Albrecht Thaer und die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts*, Tübingen, 1913.

² With E. Kneek, *Lessing und die Erziehung d. Menschengeschlechts*, Heidelberg, 1913, I have dealt in my book on Lessing, as far as the spiritual problem of the *Education* is at stake. The same is true of G. Fittbogen, *Die Religion Lessings*, Leipzig, 1923, and his preceding articles:

Euphorion, xxi, 314 ff., 1914, and *Preussische Jahrbücher*, clv, 350 ff., 1914.

³ Scholz in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, clv, 71 ff., 1914, Olshausen in his, partly, very valuable commentary to Lessing's philosophical works in the *Goldene Klassiker-Bibliothek* and W. Simons, *Albrecht Thaer*, Berlin, 1929.

⁴ *Theologische Blätter*, x, no. 11, 1931.

⁵ *Ibid.*

zeigen, dass Ihnen das Problem noch nicht aufgegangen ist'. I may now be allowed to show how far this is correct.¹

One word first, on the assertion, often made by the advocates of the rights of Thaeer, that Lessing himself had always said that he was the editor, not the author of the *Education*. This argument proves nothing. On the contrary, if the fact that the work begins with a 'Vorwort des Herausgebers' makes Lessing's authorship doubtful, then most of the writings of the theological author Lessing must have been written by others. For as regards the majority of them, Lessing does not at all reveal himself as author. Where his most personal life is in question, where he deals with religious problems, he does not choose to stand in the limelight of publicity. The positivists, eager to find a system in Lessing, have never grasped the secret of his existence, namely, that a fighting critic can be at the same time of a most tender reservedness in all matters of his innermost convictions.

In October 1785, Albrecht Thaeer, then a physician in the small country town of Celle, on the edge of the Luneburg heath, wrote down the *Lebenslauf und Bekenntnisse für Philippinen* which was first mentioned in connexion with Lessing by Korte. In these confessions, with which Thaeer wanted to win his future wife, there are two paragraphs which induced Körte to proclaim the *Education* as the work of young Thaeer. These paragraphs run:²

...und in der Vorstellung der Lehren war ich weder mit den Orthodoxen, noch mit den neueren sogenannten Berliner Theologen einig. Ich ersann mir ein neues System und brachte es flüchtig aufs Papier. Es ward wider meinen Willen abgeschrieben, fiel in die Hände eines grossen Mannes, der den Stil etwas umanderte und einen Teil davon als Fragment eines unbekannten Verfassers herausgab. Nachher ist auch der zweite Teil herausgekommen, aber mit Zusätzen woran ich keinen Anteil habe. Bis jetzt wissen es nur drei lebende Leute, dass ich der Urheber bin [there is a note: doch giebt es mehrere, die es vermuten, und gegen die ich es streng leugne]. Ich kann mich auf ihre Verschwiegenheit verlassen. In meiner und der Dinge Lage mochte ich um alles nicht, dass es bekannt wurde. Wegen des Namens des Herausgebers und der zu grossen Abkürzung der Satze ist es ganz widersinnig von allen Parteien missverstanden worden. Und es ist doch so klar für jeden, der's unbefangen in die Hand nimmt. Anfangs las ich alles was dafür, dawider und darüber herauskam, jetzt eckelt's mich. Von allem was ich Ihnen vertraut habe und vertrauen werde, müssen Sie dieses am strengsten verschwiegen halten, bis ich es einmal ratsam finde, hervorzutreten. Ich hatte es Ihnen selbst nicht gesagt, wenn Sie mich nicht über meine religiösen Meinungen gefragt hatten. Aber ich habe es mir vorgenommen, Ihnen über alles was Sie wissen, die reinste Auskunft zu geben. Wollen Sie das Buchlein lesen, so will ich es Ihnen bringen. Ein Ausdruck, den Sie neulich brauchten, lässt mich hoffen, dass unsere Seelen auch hier in Einklang

¹ It is not possible for me to deal here with the attitude of other writers to Körte's opinion. But it is necessary to stress two points. Krüger omits Th. Fontane who, in 1863, thought it very likely that 'nach den scharfsinnigen und sehr eingehenden Untersuchungen von W. Körte' the *Education* may be 'eine Jugendarbeit Albrecht Thaeers' (*Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*, 9th edition, Stuttgart, 1907, p. 118). One has to bear in mind that Fontane was indeed hostile to that Lessing which his own epoch glorified (cf the letter to his wife of 12 August 1883, on the subject of *Nathan der Weise*). D. F. Strauss, in the *Christliche Glaubenslehre* (1840), 'took into account', as Krüger says, the well-known 'von Lessing wo nicht verfassten doch adoptierten Abhandlung'. He 'takes into account', but he does not do more. His real opinion, omitted by Krüger, is stated in the

Zusätze to the *Alte und neue Glaube*, which was written more than thirty years after the *Glaubenslehre*. Strauss deals here with the *Education* in one of the finest passages ever written on Lessing, without mentioning Thaeer, or, for that matter, Körte. H. Thielcke, *Vernunft und Offenbarung*, Gütersloh, 1936, asserts on p. 54: 'Die bekannte Anzweiflung Lessings zu Gunsten A. Thaeers gilt als überwunden'. For that reason, he refers to *Reallexikon der Religionsgeschichte*, III, 1593. But here, Martin Haug stresses almost the reverse! The authoress of a book on the *Education* ('eine Auseinandersetzung mit der Lessing-Forschung'), Berlin, 1935, apparently a university thesis, Martha Waller, is in no way qualified to deal with such a subject. But it may be noted that she too refutes Leisegang's 'system'.

² Quoted from Simons, loc. cit. pp. 7 and 11.

stehen. In einzelnen Stücken habe ich wohl meine Meinung geändert, aber die Vorstellung im ganzen wird mir bleiben, bis ich die Wahrheit nicht mehr im Schleier, sondern in ihrem reinem Lichte erblicken werde.

When Thaer was a student at Göttingen in 1773, at the age of twenty-one, he is said to have put his 'System' into writing. Three years later, in 1776, Thaer travelled to Berlin with his friend Leisewitz. What happened there? The second passage in the *Confessions* runs:

Wir hatten von Jerusalem und Lessing vollwichtige Adressen an alle grossen Männer in Berlin.... Ich glaube, ich war bei meiner Abreise aus Berlin stehen geblieben. Die Reisebeschreibung will ich Ihnen schenken. Zwei Tage brachte ich doch bei Lessing zu, die ich unter die interessantesten meines Lebens rechne, weil ich da Dinge gesehen und gehört habe, die bis dahin noch in keines Menschen Auge und Ohr gekommen waren, die ich aber nur halb verstand.

When Leisewitz began his journey to Berlin, Lessing gave him letters of recommendation to his brother Karl, to Mendelssohn as well as to Nicolai, Ramler and J. J. Engel.¹ But as far as Lessing was concerned, these recommendations seem only to have referred to Leisewitz. He does not mention Thaer nor do the replies of the brother and of Nicolai, which alone have been preserved, mention him. Still, one may say that Lessing had a very high opinion of *Julius von Tarent*, and that Leisewitz introduced his friend Thaer to 'all the great men' to whom he himself gained admittance through Lessing. But it is highly improbable that in these letters Lessing should not have mentioned Thaer also, who in 1776, as his 'co-operator', must have been on far closer terms with him than Leisewitz was. For he is supposed to have set about either arranging or else literally using for the *Wolfenbüttler Beyträge* a manuscript of this very same Thaer, namely, the *Education of Mankind*. If, then, Thaer wants to create the impression that he was really the author of the *Education*, one cannot help feeling that he knowingly kept secret the visit of 1780 in order to bring that of 1776, which is said to have taken place just before Lessing took up the *Fragments* again, into the limelight—and himself as well. That the visit of 1776 should indeed be regarded with suspicion (but without accusing Thaer of deliberate deception) seems to me the result of other circumstances. A small volume of the collected works of Leisewitz appeared a year before Korte's biography.² In the short sketch of his life which is attached to the volume we read: 'Leisewitz' Aufenthalt in Berlin dehnte sich bis zu Anfang des August aus; dann kehrte er nach Braunschweig zurück. Thaer ging nach Celle, blieb aber mit Leisewitz in brieflichem Verkehr, von Ueberbleibseln daraus verlautete jedoch nichts.' The writer states expressly that both, Leisewitz and Thaer, were amicably received in Berlin, thus confirming the above-mentioned conjecture. But on the other hand: 'Thaer went to Celle.' That does not necessarily exclude the possibility that he stayed in Brunswick for a short while in order to see Lessing. But that would hardly have been omitted by the writer who is elsewhere so well informed as to details. Therefore one must always consider the possibility that he wishes to say that Thaer took leave of his friend before they reached Brunswick. Yet another and more important point must be mentioned in this connexion. Karl Lessing, in Berlin, ends a letter to his brother, on 2 August, with the words:³ 'I should like to say a lot more to you; but Herr Leisewitz, who will deliver the letter, wants to get on his way.' In other words, Leisewitz wants to leave Berlin. One might say concerning this: 'Perhaps Thaer remained behind, perhaps Leisewitz

¹ All these letters are of 16 June 1776 (Lachmann-Muncker, xviii, 172 ff.).

² Braunschweig, 1838.

³ Lachmann-Muncker, xxi, 116.

only "wanted to get away" from Karl Lessing's house, not from Berlin.' But that is improbable. We know nothing of the friends separating, even in Berlin, and Lessing's brother would not have used the expression he chose if Leisewitz had put off his departure until September, or if he had been travelling to and fro between Berlin and Wolfenbüttel with Thaer during August. Nor is the fact that Lessing did not answer Karl's letter till 15 September a proof to the contrary. Leisewitz could certainly not have delivered the letter, entrusted to his care, at the beginning of August. For, on the same second day of this month when Karl wrote his letter, Lessing wrote to Eva König, saying that 'he would leave here tomorrow, Saturday, 3 August, without fail', and he announces his return to her a month later.¹ Thaer, then, could not have seen Lessing in Wolfenbüttel during August. As far as September is concerned, I have already remarked that the fact that Lessing does not mention Thaer is no proof that the interview did not take place. Many letters of Lessing are lost, and in those which we know as lost, he would scarcely have had any cause to mention Thaer, even if he had really seen him. But throughout September Lessing is absorbed in two affairs, the Mannheim appointment and his marriage to Eva König. In the many letters to Eva we notice a great unrest and anxiety about any disturbance even without any connexion with either of these matters. 'Dass mir der Mann doch immer so ungelegen kommen muss', he says about a surprise visit of Gleim. Would Thaer's visit have been any more convenient, even supposing he had come at all? Would Lessing, who writes so circumstantially to Eva, have made no mention of him if he had been overjoyed at this visit? Or has he deliberately kept secret the visit of his alleged 'collaborator' in order not to turn the attention of Eva to a man whose manuscript he wanted to publish in the first year of marriage under the title of *The Education of Mankind*?

We will leave the answer until later and turn to the statements of Thaer which reproduce the impressions he received from Lessing. The two days which he says he spent with him he reckons as 'the most interesting of his life'. Why? 'Because I have heard and seen there things which until then had never entered the eyes and ears of anybody, which I, however, only half understood.' Even Olshausen² had to admit that these words sound strange. But the reason which he gives is much stranger than the words of Thaer himself. Guhrauer had thundered against Körte and Thaer³ that of Lessing 'da wahrhaftig wie von einem Alchymisten und Charlatan, mit einer lächerlichen Geckerei gesprochen wird'. Olshausen repeats that and thinks that the words of Thaer seem to be more suitable for a visit to an alchemist than for the company of a man like Lessing. But what is more 'strange' is the fact that a young man who in 1773 should have written a *Vorlage* for Lessing, only 'half' understood it when he visited or said he visited him three years later. And Thaer's daughter even asserted after the death of her father that he had already exchanged letters with Lessing before he met him personally.⁴ Has then Thaer also only 'half' understood him? The family tradition of the Thaers is no clearer than young Thaer himself on later investigation. In a letter to Guhrauer, Wilhelmine Thaer wrote: 'Die Sache ist von Lessing wie von Thaer mit einer solchen Dunkelheit umhüllt, dass ich glaube, auch der tiefdenkendste Forscher kann nur vermuten, nicht beweisen, welcher Aufsatz in den Wolfenbüttler Fragmenten aus der Feder meines Vaters geflossen ist.' How it is that Lessing should have 'shrouded' something in this matter in obscurity remains undiscoverable,

¹ Ibid. xviii, 182 f.² Loc. cit. p. 55.³ Loc. cit. p. 221.⁴ Simons, loc. cit. p. 251 ff. (and for the following quotations).

unless one insists that this obscurity lies in the fact that he never mentions Thaer! But if Mr A has published a book and Mr B has asserted—if he has asserted it!—that he is the author of the book in notes which only become known more than fifty years after A's death, one cannot possibly conclude from it that A has 'shrouded that in obscurity'. One cannot even maintain it of B, or, at most, only vis-à-vis his then fiancée. It is to Fraulein Thaer's credit that she was not convinced by Korte's argument. Her attitude is much more scholarly than that of later scholars. Through her we know that her father never spoke about the business, but 'often and willingly' about Lessing. 'Sprachen wir aber von den Fragmenten, um etwas darüber zu hören, so brach er kurz ab, wir sahen, er wollte darüber nicht reden.' One might therefore go so far as to say that Thaer, if he so openly adopted the ideas of the *Education* as his own, but on the other hand broke off when the *Fragments* became the subject of conversation, wished 'to shroud something in obscurity' as regards the *Fragments* in general but not the *Education*. Actually, Korte was originally of the opinion that Thaer, not Reimarus, was the author of the *Fragments*, and that the 'system' which Thaer 'created' according to the 'confessions', was first applied to the 'Duldung der Deisten'.¹ When Lessing first began to publish the *Fragments*, there was a great deal of guesswork about the author. For the following, it is especially important that Korte mentioned, among those who were said to be the authors, an Unzer whom he describes as a brother to the 'Altonaer Arzt'. This doctor was also a poet and connected in many ways with the circle of Klopstock and with the Hamburg theatre, and his brother who died young was a collaborator of Mauvillon. The critical work which they wrote jointly is a landmark in the history of criticism in Germany.² But it is of the utmost importance for our problem, as we shall see, that Thaer was a friend of the Altona doctor.

Thaer, then, on his real or supposed visit in 1776, did 'see and hear things from Lessing which had never entered into the eyes and ears of any man until now', i.e. not into his either, quite apart from the fact that he only 'half' understood them. What he had as yet never heard in 1776, a year before the publication of the first part of the *Education*, cannot, therefore, be identified with the 'new system' which he himself 'produced and hastily put on paper' in Göttingen where he was studying with Leisewitz and Unzer. If we ask what Thaer did, according to his own statements, with the 'new system' and what his own opinion was of his connexion with Lessing, the result is completely negative—unless one reads into his confessions something which is not there. His 'system' was copied 'against his will' and 'fell into the hands of a great man'. One can reason that the phrase 'against my will' was necessitated by the feelings of the lady who received the confessions and whom Thaer would like to convince that he never on his own accord published anything which could hurt her orthodox feelings. This would explain also the 'fell'. The 'great man' would then have published a part of the manuscript against Thaer's will 'as a fragment of an unknown author'. On the other hand, there follows at once the sentence 'afterwards the second part also came out, but with additions wherein I have no part'. That naturally is magnificently suited to the *Education*. That Lessing's *Vorbericht* to the complete edition of the *Education* does not speak against him as author has been already shown.

¹ Korte, p. 350.

² I have mentioned him in my book on Gerstenberg. The collaborator of Mauvillon and the physician are not one and the same person as

is maintained by the author of the Index to my Gerstenberg and of the Catalogue of the British Museum.

But there is, in a manner of speaking, another *Vorbericht*, although, in the strict sense of the word, it is not a *Vorbericht* at all. I mean the sentences which immediately precede the *Education* in the *Gegensätzen*.¹ There Lessing says: 'Unter einem gewissen Zirkel von Freunden ist vor einiger Zeit ein kleiner Aufsatz in der Handschrift herumgegangen, welcher die ersten Linien zu einem ausführlichen Buche enthält und überschrieben war: Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts', and Thaer says that 'only three living people', of whom Lessing was perhaps one, know that he was the author. 'Ich muss bekennen', Lessing goes on, 'dass ich von einigen Gedanken dieses Aufsatzes wörtlich Gebrauch gemacht habe. Was hindert mich also oder vielmehr was ist also schicklicher als dass ich den Anfang desselben in seinem ganzen Zusammenhang mitteile, der sich auf den Inhalt unseres vierten Fragments so genau beziehet?' Indeed, what hinders him? Nothing, for the plagiarist Lessing could not know that the young man whose manuscript he seized upon in 1776, in order to publish it as his own, was so inconsiderate, from Lessing's point of view, and so considerate, from his own point of view, as to write down the true circumstances, in anticipation that, after his death, the faithful biographer would defend the claims of the great Thaer against the 'great man' who was in fact only a little Lessing! Thus, Thaer's 'system' was not published like the *Education* anonymously; the editor gave his name, and Thaer is prepared to bring his 'little book' to Miss Philippine. He, therefore, would hardly have spoken of the 'name of the editor' if it had not been printed on the first page. In 1785, perhaps, he could count on the fact that everyone knew that the anonymous author of the *Education* was Lessing. But not in 1780 and still less in 1777. Should the fact that Thaer does not name Lessing point to his tendency to obscurity? Some may think so, particularly as Thaer asks his bride for strict discretion, 'till I find it advisable to come forward'. But he never found it 'advisable' to come forward in this matter. I think it is much simpler to say that Thaer in spite of all the puzzles which his confessions present did not intend to say that he was the author. It is, moreover, psychologically rather improbable that he mentioned the visit to Wolfenbüttel with pride, but not the name of the editor of his 'system', about which he would have been much prouder if that had been the same person as Lessing. If, as is most probable, Thaer was in Wolfenbüttel, not in 1776 but in 1780, then he had even more reason to be proud of his editor and to reveal his name.

On 9 March 1781 there was held in the Hamburg theatre a ceremony in honour of Lessing who had died a few weeks before. It was preceded by a prologue which contained the following lines:

Ihn selbst (der Edle), ihm ist wohl.
Erweise nun, welch höh're Stelle
Ein höh'rer Geist bekleiden soll,
Ihn durstete, nun ist er an der Quelle.

They anticipate the words which Thaer wrote about Lessing to his bride on 22 November 1785 when he was writing his confessions:² 'I wish happiness to the great man, for that he died and entered the light of truth whose brilliance blinded him here on earth, in time.' The author of the prologue was the above-mentioned Johann Christoph Unzer, who, when Thaer came to Göttingen, had already been studying medicine there for several years and played a prominent part among the students. These lines which are to be found in Unzer's *Hinterlassene Schriften*³

¹ Lachmann-Muncker, xii, 446.

² Simons, p. 33.

³ *Hinterl. Schriften poetischen Inhalts*, Altona, 1811, p. 97 f.

clearly show the same respect for orthodoxy as those of Thaer. What to the latter was the pious bride was to the former the Chief Pastor of Hamburg who was inimical to the theatre and Lessing's chief theological adversary. Unzer was highly gifted. Otherwise people would hardly have attributed the *Fragments* to him either. He recognized the importance of the nervous system even before Thaer, and a book of his on the subject of mesmerism¹ is remarkably modern in many passages. His was one of those transitional natures so frequently found at that time. It is not by chance that he rewrote Lenz's *Hofmeister* for the Hamburg theatre, and that his own tragedy *Diego und Leonore* was forbidden. He belonged to those who pass judgement at an inopportune moment, who realize the eventual danger of such an attitude and who are not prepared or not able to make the sacrifice demanded by it. Merck committed suicide. Unzer escaped by burying himself completely in his medical career. Perhaps that too was a form of suicide. If so, then what happened in his everyday life was merely a repetition of what had previously happened in the spiritual sphere. What the literature of the time has to say about him is extremely contradictory, a fact which does not tell against him. The great Schröder calls him a 'magnificent young man'.² When Schröder's step-sister, the tragedienne Dorothea Ackermann, appeared for the last time on the stage, it was Unzer, her fiancé, who wrote the farewell speech to the public for her:³

So eil' ich stolz, mit anspruchsvollem Herzen,
Der winkenden Bestimmung zu.

But they were both wrong. Boie's prediction came true.⁴ Her 'pretentious heart' found no satisfaction in her husband, nor did he in her. But it was nearly twenty years before the scandal-loving circles of Hamburg and Altona enjoyed the spectacle of a much-publicized divorce suit. It was much longer before an official document concerning this divorce appeared. And with this unpleasant document came too the solution of the Lessing-Thaer problem.

Between 1910 and 1914 I searched many libraries and family archives in northern Germany, particularly in Schleswig-Holstein, and in Denmark, for letters from the German circle in Copenhagen and also those of the *Hain* and of the Hamburg families who were more or less acquainted with Klopstock and his friends. I only made known what related directly to my own publications. But even with reference to these, I was not always permitted to publish what I had found. I wrote to the widow of Julius Campe, the famous publisher, who was then living in Paris, concerning the treasures contained in the archives of the bookshop of Hoffmann and Campe in Hamburg, but with no result. Now, a little after the centenary of Körte's book, I have the opportunity of publishing a letter which I found at Hoffmann and Campe's and which, I think, destroys at last a legend which has lived for more than a century.

The records were in such a condition that they defy all description. Among comparatively unknown representative works of intellectual Hamburg, I found, for example, a complete edition in manuscript of the Strassburg *Till Eulenspiegel* of 1519, with introduction and notes by Ludwig Wienbarg. Beside it I found a handsomely done-up parcel labelled 'Lessing'. When I opened it, there was not a word by or about Lessing. First a copy of the three *Priapische Oden* fell into my hands, the result of a bet between Bürger, Voss and Stolberg. Then followed

¹ *Beschreibung eines mit dem künstlichen Magneten angestellten medicinischen Versuchs*, Hamburg, 1775.

² Fitzmann, Schröder, II, 224.

³ Cf. *Hinterl. Schriften*, p. 97 f.

⁴ Cf. Strodttmann, *Briefe von und an Bürger*, II, 154 f.

another copy in the same handwriting of the above-mentioned document, a 'most humble representation' from the German chancellery in Copenhagen to the King of Denmark of the year 1797 which deals with the divorce of the Unzers. I already knew of the original from manuscripts in the government archives in Copenhagen. All that concerns us is the fact, of a certain piquant interest, that Dorothea had already parted from her husband in 1794 and had gone with her children to Rellingen near Hamburg. F. L. Schröder lived in Rellingen. Many actors who had failed in life found refuge in his country house. Among them was Abel Seyler, the father-in-law of Leisewitz. Thus in the person of the great actor Schröder, both the circles who are important in the question we are dealing with, the circles of Thae and Unzer, met.

The parcel headed 'Lessing' contained, moreover, some letters and drafts of letters by Unzer as well as letters to him. His letters I had already come across at other places, many of them in the famous Munich 'Kiste', with what are called Gerstenberg's literary remains. Somebody must have come across this parcel who knew the Thae problem well. Otherwise the label was not understandable unless one assumes that the parcel contained originally letters from and to Lessing. Among these letters is the following. Handwriting and the facts leave not the slightest doubt that it is a letter from Unzer addressed to Thae.

The letter reads:

A(ltona), den 5ten Novbr. (1777).

Lieber Bruder,¹ freylich ist es recht hasslich von mir, dass ich dir so lange nicht geschrieben habe. Anstatt dir zu versichern dass ich noch der Alte sey, will ich dir sagen, dass es mit der Kunde, die dir zu Ohren gekommen ist, Gottlob! seine Richtigkeit hat. Wie das doch in der bes[z]ten aller Welten so oft zusammenhangt. Hatte ich nicht auf den Rath du weisst von wem, D. so hofirt, so ware jetzt noch die Unabhangigkeit, aber nicht das Mädchen mein.

Ja, ich bin herrlich verliebet, werde rechtschaffen und ganz wiedergeliebet und werde hoffentlich so glucklich seyn wie ich es verdiene und seyn kann. Mit Schmerz hat unsere Liebe den Anfang genommen. Jetzt hat sie sich mit Freude geendigt. D[orothea] ist das weiblichste und klugste Weib, das ich je gesehen habe. In ihrem Wesen ist eben so viel Vertrauen zu sich selber wie Sanftheit, und in jeden Vorfall zeigt sie sich gelassen und biegsam und wagt ihn und die Menschen kluger als die meisten von uns. Sie ist nicht ohne Ehrgeiz, aber sie hasst das Theater. Ihr Bruder² hat keine Geheimnisse vor mir, aber dass sie das Theater, das ihr wirklich rechtschaffen zuwider ist, verlässt, macht ihn oft hüzig gegen sie und mich. Nachstens (!) Fruhjahr wird sie zum letzten Mal in Diego vor dem Publikum stehen.³

Es ist sicheres Brod, worauf ich eine Frau nehme. Du weisst, mein ganzes Leben ist eine Kette schmerzhafter Gefühle gewesen und ich denke nicht gern dahin zuruck. Aber ich will auch keine abgefeilte Kugel werden.

Kommst du nicht wieder einmal heruber? Du musst mir mehr von dem Kreis deiner Damen erzahlen. Gestern traf ich B. und Onkel Toby,⁴ Gesellschaft bei E. E. wollte viel von dir wissen. Ich erzählte ihm dass ich in Göttingen dein Waffenträger war, als du den metaphysischen Unsinn los werden wolltest. Er schien darüber recht erstaunt zu sein, und H. meinte dass meine Bruderschaft dann grundlich gewirkt haben müsse. Er gab einen schrecklichen Bericht von dem Tode des jungen S. in F. Er hat für das leiden und bussen müssen, was andere bis ins höchste Alter fortreiben dürfen. Warum hast du mir niemals meine Frage beantwortet? Es ist nun über zwei Jahre, dass ich keine Zeile darüber von dir erhalten habe. Ist in der Medicin was wichtiges zum Vorschein gekommen, so melde es mir. Oder bist du wieder ein Stockwerk herunter geklet-

¹ It is possible too that this address does not refer to the membership of the *Hainbund*, but to the fact that both Thae and Unzer were at the same time freemasons.

² F. L. Schroder, the step-brother of Dorothea.

³ This did not come true. As already mentioned, the performances of Unzer's *Diego* were forbidden. The last appearance of Dorothea on the stage took place in June.

⁴ See n. 1, p. 326.

tert? Das wird bei mir keinen guten Eingang finden. Ernsthaft, mein Getreuer, es hat mich erschrocken, wie du uber dem Gebaude der Tugend loslegst. Wie froh warest du endlich als dein Bruder es dir forttrug und M. es unter seine theologischen Trompetenstosse aufnahm. Du konntest nicht klein genug davon denken. Du hast Witz, du hast Kenntnisse, du hast Herz. Soll das alles in Zelle zum Teufel gehen? Willst du maechtiger Sunder ein kindischer Bussprediger werden? Ich glaub's nicht. Oder haben dir die Berliner Pfaffen zugesetzt, dass sich das kalte Blut deiner [not legible] zu dem seichten Gewasser des Moralgeschwatz es abgewallt hat? Ich glaub auch das nicht. Halte Diat und frage doch Zimmermann. Ich konnte es mit dem Manne nicht aushalten, aber Onkel Toby¹ halt viel [?] auf ihn.

Heute Nachmittag bin ich mit D. nach der Rabe verabredet. Wir wollen Kegel spielen und ich schreibe dann weiter.

At this point the much-corrected draft breaks off. The other documents in the parcel give no further information concerning the question with which we are here concerned; in the case of two of them, no proof can be shown that they were written to Thaer. But our draft is quite sufficient to solve the Lessing-Thaer question. The missing year is 1777, for Dorothea left the stage in 1778. That she is meant by the letter D. is evident from the reference to Unzer's *Diego*. The names Goettingen and Celle are written out. There were certainly other people living in Celle to whom Unzer could have written. But what one might call the medical character of the most important paragraph, the role of tutor which Unzer endeavours to play in this letter, and which he did play in Goettingen, and the question concerning medical literature prove that the letter was written to a doctor in Celle. The passages on the *Gebaude der Tugend* prove that the doctor living in Celle can be no one but Thaer. The *Gebaude* was *fortgetragen* by a 'brother' and given to another person who *es aufnahm* among writings which Unzer calls 'theological trumpet-blasts'; in other words, Thaer's 'system' which, as it says in the 'confessions', 'fell' into the 'hands' of another. Who this other person was cannot yet be said. But in any case it was not Lessing. The letter M. is written quite clearly. One naturally thinks of Mauvillon. The turn of phrase, 'your brother', naturally does not refer to a relative of Thaer, but is merely used as in the beginning of the letter. Probably it is Unzer himself. Unzer, and not only his brother, had friendly relations with Mauvillon. There is a poem on him in the *Hinterlassene Schriften*. On the other hand, there is nothing by Mauvillon, as far as I know, which could be called 'theological trumpet-blasts'. Perhaps Mauvillon in his turn gave the 'Building' or the 'System' to someone else, and perhaps published it, under a pseudonym, or anonymously. The reference to the *Pfaffen* fits Thaer also, who was in Berlin with Leisewitz more than a year before Unzer wrote his letter. As one is justified in supposing that Leisewitz also knew of Thaer's 'Building', then Unzer would be the second of the three people who according to the *Confessions* had any knowledge of the affair.

The visit to Lessing in 1776 is not mentioned. But that was not necessary either. It is certain that Thaer did not write the *Education*, and we have no definite proof that he wanted to be thought of as author of it. But neither can one maintain that he purposely invented the visit of 1776, for purposes of mystification. Actually, he first visited Lessing in 1780. Lessing writes to Eschenburg on 16 July 1780: 'Wir haben uns doch auch recht verstanden? Sie, Herr Leisewitz und der H. Doctor, den ich noch nicht zu nennen weiss, besuchen mich nicht allein morgen, sondern essen auch bei mir?' The 'H. Doctor' is Thaer as we know from Leisewitz.

¹ The nickname of the Hamburg physician Mumssen, well known in the circles of Klopstock. Many very interesting letters from him are not yet published.

But Lessing 'does not yet know his name'. He does not yet know a man who is supposed to have visited him four years before and whose work he is said to have published in its entirety, or jointly with him, only three months before! .

Or is yet another interpretation possible? After another hundred years, a 'wiser judge' might explain that Unzer's letter to Thaer says nothing because that from Lessing to Eschenburg has been interpreted falsely. Somebody has indeed found a letter to Thaer which shows without doubt that he was not in Wolfenbittel in 1776, but at the same time shows the reason which prevented Lessing in 1780 from 'naming the doctor'. For Eschenburg and Leisewitz had decided between themselves not to tell their host the name of his third guest, Thaer, in order to prepare for him a pleasant surprise on that summer's day which he would spend with the real author of that immortal work called *The Education of Mankind*. And, indeed, the fact that one 'does not yet know the name' of a man whom one is expecting certainly does not prove that one has never seen him before.

ALBERT MALTE WAGNER

LONDON

LAWS OF LANGUAGE AND LAWS OF NATURE

Two psychological factors presided over the formulation of the basic principles of comparative philology: one linguistic, and one extraneous. The former one was the unparalleled prestige enjoyed by the set of regularities governing the Teutonic sound-shift, discovered by the Dane Rask but imposed as Grimm's Law by German science. This was, and remains, the most harmonious instance of the so-called 'equidistant' changes—the three groups involved taking each other's place while the distances between the three levels—spirants, affricates, aspirates, voiced explosives, and voiceless explosives—remain undisturbed in the long run. In its regularity and its aesthetic features it resembles the great vowel-shift which separates the Middle English from the Modern English period, but its range in space and time is incomparably wider. When another Dane, Verner, showed that some apparent flaws in the sound-shift could also be reduced to a simple and universal formula, the last lingering doubts were dispelled, and 'Grimm's Law' became the archetype which all future students would try to equal.

The other moulding influence reached linguistics from outside: from the rise of mathematical and natural science in general, and from Darwin's theory of evolution in particular. The new science of language tried to justify its own *raison d'être* by claiming to have the same standards of scientific accuracy as the natural sciences. August Schleicher, who believed so fanatically in comparative philology that he wrote a fable in *Primitive Indo-European*, went furthest in this direction when he asserted that languages were living organisms with successive phases of growth, maturity, and decay.¹ In *The Science of Language*, 1861, Max Müller laid down the programme of linguistic research as he saw it:

I always took it for granted that the science of language, which is best known in this country by the name of comparative philology, is one of the physical sciences, and that therefore its method ought to be the same as that which has been followed by so much success in botany, geology, anatomy, and other branches of the study of nature.²

It was in this atmosphere that, in the eighties of the last century, the 'Neo-Grammarians' evolved their conception of the iron regularity of sound changes, which culminated in the 'blind necessity' ('blinde Notwendigkeit') doctrine of Osthoff, and which, qualified by the constructive criticism of Schuchardt, Jespersen³ and others, gave rise to the causal formulae known as linguistic laws. Such laws are defined as regular changes operating under certain conditions, and within clearly defined boundaries of time and space; symbolically: 'A sign becomes B sign in C period within D area, under E set of conditions.'

How far do such regularities, even if unimpeachable, deserve the name of law? It is obvious that we are faced with a metaphorical use of the term 'law', not in its ethical and legal acceptation which is obviously irrelevant in dealing with language changes, but in its widespread use in natural science. This transfer represents in a nutshell the synthesis of the two factors, or aspirations, which

¹ See Schleicher's *Die Darwinische Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft* (1873); cf. on this question V. Henry, *Antinomies Linguistiques* (1896).

² Quoted in R. A. Wilson, *The Miraculous Birth of Language* (1941), p. 66.

³ See O. Jespersen's sketch of the development of his own attitude in three stages: *Linguistica*

(1933). A new and fruitful approach to the problem of sound-change can be found in H. L. Koppelman, *Ursachen des Lautwandels* (Leiden, 1939), where the acceptance factor (Rezeption) is especially emphasized (see esp. pp. 21-2; cf. also *M.L.R.* xxxvi, 400 f.).

inspired the pioneers of modern linguistics: their veneration for the sound-shift, and their determination to raise and maintain their science on a level with physics and other exact studies. It was perhaps no coincidence that one of the leading neo-grammarians, Sievers, emulated Adams and Leverrier's discovery of the planet Neptune—or more recently, Professor Lowell's discovery of the planet Pluto—by his brilliant assumption of the existence of a Continental sister text of the 'Heliand' which served as a model for part of the 'O.E. Genesis', an assumption borne out by the facts nearly twenty years later.

Undoubtedly, the accuracy and precision of such formulae—as long as they operate without unexplained exceptions—which is rarely the case—brings linguistics appreciably nearer the absolute scientific standard than most non-physical studies can hope to progress, nevertheless, the fact remains that the spatio-temporal restrictions on the validity of language laws distinguish them radically from physical laws; they prevent them, in particular, from making any forecasts as to future developments. To this must be added the effects of analogy and other linguistic or external forces disturbing the smooth working of the 'laws'. In Chapter xv of his *Language*, Jespersen tried to obviate some of these difficulties. He rejected Meringer's view that sound-laws are merely like 'laws' of fashion in dress,¹ by pointing out that the similarity, if any, was confined solely to the second or imitative phase, the spreading of language changes. In a later passage (ibid. p. 297), he suggested that instead of phonetic 'laws' one should rather speak of formulae or rules. If, however, it was wished to preserve the term, it should be viewed as a juridical principle which had to be observed by scholars in advancing etymologies, under the penalty of 'being put outside the pale of serious students'. This interpretation, which deliberately puts the cart before the horse, does not of course claim to be more than a very pertinent witticism. More important, however, is the alternative suggestion put forward by Jespersen at the same place:

In another respect phonetic laws may be compared with what we might call a Darwinian law in zoology, such as this: the forelimbs of the common ancestor of mammals have developed into flippers in whales and into hands in apes and men... a microscopic examination of whales, even an exact investigation by means of the eye alone, will reveal innumerable little deviations: no two flippers are exactly alike... A law of fore-limb development can only be deduced through such observation of many flippers as will single out what is typical of whales' flippers, and then a comparison with the typical fore-limbs of their ancestors or of their congeners among existing mammals. And in the same way we do not find laws of phonetic development until, after leaving what can be examined as it were microscopically, we go on telescopically to examine languages which are far removed from each other in space or time: then small differences disappear, and we discover nothing but the great lines of a regular evolution which is the outcome of an infinite number of small movements in many different directions.

This penetrating passage had to be quoted *in toto*, since it has a direct bearing on the subject of this inquiry. At the present stage, however, it seems to meet only one half of the difficulties under review. It does explain why the many little exceptions and deviations from the rigid formulae do not necessarily impair their scientific value and validity; but what it fails to achieve is to remove the major difference separating sound-laws from physical laws: namely, the spatio-temporal limitations inherent *per definitionem* in the former. Whatever little differences there may exist between individual organs, one can safely predict that any future whale in any sea will, under certain sets of conditions, exhibit the same type of forelimb. Against this we may set, say, the law that M.E. *ī* was diphthongized sometime in

¹ O. Jespersen, *Language, its Nature, Development, and Origin* (repr. 1934), p. 291.

the course of the fifteenth century, and that such exceptions as there are to this rule are, on the whole, no more serious than the individual differences between the flippers of various whales. But this rule does not enable us to forecast a similar development in some other place or at some other time, not even if an analogous sound-change can be detected in some other language, as it can in this case in late M.H.G. and early N.H.G.,¹ we have indeed a close correspondence between O.E. *bitan* > MnE. *bite*, and O.H.G. *bizan* > N.H.G. *beissen*. If adequate evidence can be adduced from various periods and languages, as, for example, in the weakening of final sounds, one may surmise that a general tendency has been at work in all such cases, but even this does not warrant any prediction to the effect that it will be found operative in any specific instance in the future. Even should the ubiquitousness of the tendency prove demonstrable without a shadow of doubt, which can scarcely be expected, it is impossible to foretell whether it will actually assert itself or whether it will be neutralized, stifled, or deflected by some other force. Thus the chances of bridging the gulf seem to be rather slender. No less an authority than J. Vendryes appears to have no hesitation in stating the hopelessness of any such endeavour:

C'est déjà par une extension fâcheuse qu'on a appliqué le mot de loi aux vérités naturelles qui résultent de l'expérience. C'est par un abus de langage qu'on attribue à la loi un caractère impératif. Les lois phonétiques ne sont même pas assimilables aux lois physiques et chimiques.²

It must, however, be borne in mind that the type of natural law which philologists had in mind both in their ambitious attempts and in their despondent verdicts has of late undergone some change in the appraisal of the physicists themselves. In view of this shift towards indeterminacy, which will be discussed at a later stage, the note of caution sounded by orthodox philologists should not deter us from looking for some borderline cases where a kind of common denominator might be found between linguistics and natural science.

I

The first step towards a possible revision or extension of the orthodox concept of linguistic laws is to ascertain the range of phenomena to which they are applicable. The neo-grammarians' formulation of laws was distinctly and deliberately confined to sound-laws, and indirectly to such changes as are ultimately reducible to sounds: associative sound-changes, accidence and word-formation, in fact the whole formal side of language: 'le signifiant', in F. de Saussure's terminology.³ There was no attempt to extend the new interpretation to the study of meaning, 'le signifié', in its lexical and syntactic implications, apart from a half-hearted and abortive experiment to classify semantic changes on the pattern of sound-changes.⁴ A glance at the history of semasiology will explain this time lag between the two branches of linguistic science. As an independent branch of study on the same footing as phonetics, accidence, and syntax, semasiology emerged as late as 1839.⁵ Nyrop's

¹ J. Wright, *Historical German Grammar*, I (1907), 58 f.

² J. Vendryes, *Le Langage* (1921), p. 50 f.

³ F. de Saussure, *Cours de Linguistique générale* (Paris, 1915, 1922), ed. Bally-Sechehaye. In *The Meaning of Meaning* (5th ed. 1938), pp. 4 ff., esp. p. 5, n. 2, Ogden and Richards reject Saussure's twofold division; it is, however, easy to show that the difference between Saussure's view and their own basic triangle (p. 11) is only

terminological, and that the classifications of semantic changes based on the two theories can be shown to be co-extensive, cf. my paper on 'The range and mechanism of changes of meaning', *J.E.G.P.* xli, 46-52.

⁴ See the semantic part of W. Wundt's *Die Sprache* (Volkerpsychologie, I)

⁵ In K. Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, quoted by Z. Gombocz in *Jelenléstan* (Pécs, 1926), p. 3.

Grammaire historique de la langue française was the first comprehensive work on language to contain, in its fourth volume, a separate and self-contained subdivision devoted to semasiology. At the time when the neo-grammarians were fighting their campaigns about sound-laws, the study of meaning had hardly reached its pioneering stage, in the work of Clédat and Bréal, Paul and Darmesteter. Undoubtedly, much headway was made in the next half-century, thanks to the efforts of Wundt and Oertel, Meillet and Roudet, Weekley and Wellander, Sperber and Erdmann; but a truly scientific approach to problems of meaning could begin only after the ground had been cleared outside linguistics. It is certainly no coincidence that the first really exhaustive linguistic monograph on semasiology was brought out by G. Stern only a few years after *The Meaning of Meaning*, and admittedly under the influence of the latter.¹ Since then, contextualists, behaviorists, and logical positivists have enlarged the field of investigation, and put an entirely new complexion on the general 'theory of signs' which, though above and outside linguistics proper, is bound to exert a moulding influence on it, and in particular on the borderline science of semasiology.²

The inchoate character of much of the earlier research work explains why there was so much hesitancy and uncertainty as to the possibility of semantic laws. Roughly speaking, the views on the subject may be grouped under three heads. The first and most unhelpful group of scholars, represented, for example, by no less an authority than A. Thomas,³ professed extreme scepticism as to the practicability of semantic laws. At the other end of the scale, Gustav Stern, in an earlier essay now embodied in *Meaning and Change of Meaning*, showed that in some cases at least semantic changes were amenable to a spatio-temporal formulation along the old lines. Between these two extremes, the majority of semasiologists believed, somewhat vaguely, that there did exist certain regular changes of meaning, but that such regularities were, at least to some extent, characteristic of the human mind in general, and not confined between the co-ordinates of space and time. This view underlies Wundt's and even Meillet's classification of semantic changes.⁴ Here, *instar omnium*, is a quotation from E. Weekley's *Romance of Words* (1917 ed., p. 86): 'The comparative study of languages enables us to observe and codify (!) the general laws which govern sense development, and to understand why meanings become extended or restricted.'

An interesting step forward in this direction was made by the Finno-Ugrian scholar Z. Gombocz (op. cit. pp. 5ff.). He recalled that Ferdinand de Saussure, who had established a watertight partition between synchronic and diachronic

¹ G. Stern, *Meaning and Change of Meaning. With Special Reference to the English Language* (Göteborgs Hogskolas Årsskrift, 1931).

² The contextual theory is championed in *The Meaning of Meaning* and other writings by the same authors, esp. I. A. Richards's *Principles of Literary Criticism and Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Behaviorism is exemplified in L. Bloomfield's *Language*; see also his 'Linguistic aspects of science' (*International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, 1, 4, 1939). For logical positivism, see, for example, R. Carnap's *Logical Syntax of Language*, and Jespersen's *Analytic Syntax*. A very clear eclectic survey of these problems can be found in K. Britton, *Communication. A Philosophical Study of Language* (International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method, 1939). For a less esoteric account see

J. R. Firth, *The Tongues of Men* (London, 1937), ch. viii-x; cf. also M. M. Bryant-J. R. Aiken, *Psychology of English* (New York, 1940), pp. 4 and 222, and the writings of Korzybski, S. Chase, and W. M. Urban.

³ A. Thomas, *Nouveaux essais de philologie française*, p. 28 (quoted by Gombocz, op. cit. p. 5); cf. also L. Weisgerber in *G.R.M.* xv (1927), 161.

⁴ A. Meillet, 'Comment les mots changent de sens' (*Année Sociologique*, ix; reprinted in *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*). Jespersen seems to hold a similar view: 'There are universal laws of thought which are reflected in the laws of change of meaning... even if the Science of Meaning... has not yet made much advance towards discovering them' (*Mankind, Nation, and Individual*, p. 212).

linguistics, had also raised—and answered in the negative—the question whether a third or ‘panchronic’ approach could also be imagined. In Gombocz’s view such an outlook might be legitimate in the sphere of semasiology. Changes of meaning reflect the workings of association in the human mind, and these are substantially identical irrespective of space and time, given a modicum of similarity in intellectual level and living conditions. If we take this brilliant conjecture as a pointer, we shall have to examine next how far such panchronic laws can be formulated in semasiology, and in what methodological respects they differ from the orthodox type of language law.

II

The recognition that languages have many traits in common both synchronically and diachronically, i.e. both in their structure at any given stage of development, and in the history of any particular element, is by no means confined to semasiology. Nor is it a modern feature; more than a hundred years ago, Humboldt was already visited by such ideas. In phonetics, the bipartition is so marked that it practically underlies the customary distinction between dependent and independent sound-changes. Antoine Meillet even went so far as to oppose ‘natural’ to ‘peculiar’ sound-changes.¹ In accidence and syntax, especially in what is called these days ‘syntactical semasiology’—a study of the referential relations, predicative, attributive, determinative, etc., which human language can express, including also the theory of the parts of speech and such problems as Jespersen’s ‘three ranks’—universal tendencies play such an important part that one may hazard the suggestion that languages have in these respects more points of agreement than points of difference. It is sufficient to remember the parallel workings of analogy, and the parallel tendencies of phoneme development detected by recent investigations in phonology.² In the more tangible and formal departments of lexicology and syntax, such parallelisms are of course far less frequent and obvious, but they cannot be altogether ignored. Thus it is possible to explain the obsolescence of the French ‘passé défini’ from purely French factors.³ Yet the fact remains that a similar tendency is demonstrable in many other Indo-European languages, so that the possibility of its corresponding to a general tendency of the human mind cannot be ruled out. A rather similar case arose of late in sound-history. Jespersen has suggested⁴ that the phonetic regularity which underlies Verner’s law, viz. the voicing of intervocalic spirants and affricates after an unstressed syllable, did not only operate as a corrective of the sound-shift, but made itself felt elsewhere and at other times as well, e.g. in the history of English spirants, in the Finnish ‘consonantal gradation series’, etc.

The examples adduced by Gombocz in support of his contention are substantially of the same kind as the above instances. He mentions the association underlying Germ. *begreifen*, Lat. *concipio*, It. *capire*, Fr. *comprendre*. Sp. *caber*, Russ. *ponati*, *ponimati*, and some similar transfers in Finno-Ugrian and Turkish languages; he might also have recorded Fr. *saisir* and Eng. *grasp*. These are all cases of ‘secondary

¹ A. Meillet, ‘Sur l’histoire des consonnes en grec’ (*M.S.L.* xix, 163–73, p. 172 f.).

² Aply summarized in A. Martinet, ‘La Phonologie’ (*Le Français Moderne*, vi (1938), 131–46), which was followed by an interesting controversy between the author and M. Grammont.

³ See on this question A. J. F. Zieglschmid.

⁴ ‘Der Untergang des einfachen Präteritums in verschiedenen indogermanischen Sprachen’ (*Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies*, pp. 369–78).

⁵ See two papers in his *Linguistica*: ‘Verner’s Law’, and ‘Voiced and voiceless fricatives in English’.

complication', in Wundt's terminology. Primary complication or 'synaesthesia' affords another set of such examples: Germ. *grelle Farbe*, Fr. *couleur criarde*, It. *colori stridenti*. Another example in point is Germ. *hell*, which is etymologically connected with Germ. *hallen*.¹

What, then, is the methodological significance of these examples and other familiar cases of the same phenomenon, such as Wundt's stock instance: 'pecunia' from 'pecu'? Undoubtedly, some of them, the more intricate ones, have the merit of unearthing similar features in seemingly independent developments, and thereby contributing to a better understanding of the latter. But they are not truly 'panchronic': they do not occur 'all the time', but 'any time', or rather 'at different times', whenever a particular stage in intellectual or cultural development favours their emergence. 'Achronic', or 'polychronic' would indeed be a more appropriate term. Moreover, they are not sure to materialize even if circumstances are most propitious: they are at the utmost universal tendencies which assert themselves in certain cases. Even such a general tendency as the weakening of the end of the word does not by any means obtain in all languages, or even throughout the history of one language. Some of them may refer to isolated changes, like 'grasp' or 'pecunia'; others may be connected with what can be called 'laws' in the various languages where they are traceable, e.g. Verner's law or the dropping of the 'passé défini'; but irrespective of their range in each individual language, they yield no laws from the general point of view, and do not warrant any forecasts as to the future. This does not mean that their heuristic value as to the future is on a level with that of orthodox language laws: the latter have no such value at all, whereas the former do indicate what *may* happen if certain outward circumstances do arise in the future; still they never do say that it is bound to happen, or that there is a definite and scientifically formulable *probability* for it to happen. Who could assert that there is a 100 %, or a 75 %, likelihood for English to voice its spirants in the Verner position in the second half of the present century? The latter question, however, is already a double one, referring to two distinct types of physical laws, absolute ones and statistical ones. From the very nature of things, and in view of the variety of factors, individual and social, which go to the making of a linguistic change, it is obvious that language does not lend itself to the formulation of absolute laws with regard to future development. It remains to be seen whether it may not be amenable to some sort of *statistical formulae*.

III

The application of statistical methods, of course in their most rudimentary form and without the mathematical rules governing statistical analysis in other sciences, is not only frequently resorted to in descriptive surveys of languages, such as Meillet and Tesnière's *Les Langues dans l'Europe Nouvelle*, but has actually found its way into diachronic studies. One striking example is Jespersen's treatment of French loan-words in English, in his *Growth and Structure of the English Language*;

¹ On 'panchronic' laws in general, and semantic laws in particular, see also G. Stern, op. cit. pp. 185-91; J. R. Firth, 'The technique of semantics' (*Transactions of the Philological Society* (1935), pp. 36-72, p. 42); L. H. Gray, *Foundations of Language* (New York, 1939), p. 24. I regret not to have been able to consult

A. Sommerfelt, 'Points de vue diachronique, synchronique et panchronique en linguistique générale' (*Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskab*, ix, 240-9), mentioned in *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, ix (1939), 32. Cf. also Manfred Sandmann, 'On linguistic explanation' (*M.L.R.* xxxvi (1941), 195-212).

based on a selective statistical analysis of *N.E.D.* material.¹ If it is now to be extended to the third or 'panchronic' branch of language study, we must select as a test case some type of change which is not unique or occasional, but goes on all the time; which, in Humboldt's words, is 'energeia', not 'ergon'. Naturally, semasiology suggests itself as a promising field of inquiry; and following up the hint contained in one of the above examples, I have selected 'synaesthesia' for this purpose.

Synaesthesia, or intersensorial association, is not a linguistic term but a psychophysiological, and, in the opinion of many scholars, a pathological one.² It stands for the very universal tendency of the human mind to establish connexions between the various senses and the sensations registered by them, either by discovering similarities between them or their mental effects, or by interlinking the various kinds of sensation co-existing in any perception.³ Examples like 'sweet sound, warm colour', etc., are so universal that they are no longer felt as images, others, like Oscar Wilde's 'green thirst' (*Ballad of Reading Gaol*), still impress one as novel and even far-fetched. Nothing more need be said at this place of the manifold psychological and aesthetic implications of this phenomenon which, in its more abnormal forms, is heightened into what is known as 'audition colorée', and which furnished certain schools of poetry, and in particular the symbolist movement, with some of the most potent weapons in its armoury. All these aspects were dealt with at some length in my recent paper on Longfellow's metaphors.⁴ Suffice it to say that the semantic change attributable to synaesthesia is known since Wundt as 'complicative change of meaning', to be distinguished from cases of 'secondary complication' where names of physical sensations are used to denote mental processes: 'sweet temper, bitter wrath', etc. It is through complicative changes of meaning that the linguist has to concern himself with synaesthetic problems. Since any semantic change reposes on associative connexions, and since synaesthesia in particular springs from association between two different fields of sensations, or rather, between two sensations⁵ belonging to two different levels of the sensorium, the main question to arise is that of the psychological distribution of the transfers, both as regards their source and their destination. Sensations of touch and heat had better be kept apart, as the speaker's consciousness is likely to distinguish between them; we have therefore six possible sources from which transfers can be effected to five different termini: a grand total of thirty possible

¹ See also on the same subject A. C. Baugh, 'The chronology of French loan-words in English' (*Modern Language Notes*, I, 90-3), and A. Koszul, 'Notes sur la courbe des emprunts de l'anglais au français' (*Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* (1937), pp. 79-82). In a paper entitled 'The rhythm of English infiltration into Classical French' (*Modern Languages*, Dec. 1941), I tried to apply similar methods to the analysis of the converse phenomenon, Anglicisms in French, on the basis of Professor Barbier's sterling lists of loans in *S.P.E.*, Tracts VII and XIII. On the possibilities of a statistical method in linguistics, see L. Bloomfield, *Language* (London ed. 1935), pp. 37 f. Cf. also the writings of E. L. Thorndike, H. S. Eaton, and especially G. K. Zipf, *Selected Studies of the Principle of Relative Frequency in Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), Part II, pp. 8-27.

² See, for example, O. Külpe, *Vorlesungen*

über Psychologie (ed. K. Buhler, 1922, 2nd ed.), pp. 176-8. See also Irving Babbitt's *New Laokoon*.

³ The latter factor, which Van Ginneken (*Levensche Bijdragen*, x, 127 f.) and others are inclined to regard as the only source of synaesthetic transfer, is in reality one special type of it.

⁴ "Composite metaphors in Longfellow's poetry" (*Review of English Studies*, xviii (1942), 219-28), where some bibliographical notes will also be found. See also Note I of Walter Silz's recent article, 'Heine's synaesthesia' (*P.M.L.A.* LVII (June 1942), 469-88). His discussion of 'shifts' (pp. 481 ff.) is particularly interesting.

⁵ Sometimes more than two different sensations are interwoven; e.g. in Stephen Phillips, *The Question*: 'beneath the moonless night, this heavy stillness without light'; cf. also Arthur Symonds's 'Proustian' poem, *Music and Memory*.

pigeonholes. Statistical tables of distribution can be computed on this principle for any substantial group of transfers: say the transfers demonstrable in the whole *œuvre* of a poet or even a coherent group or school of poets. If a sufficient number of calculations is made it will show whether the transfers take place in a completely haphazard way, whether they reflect the workings of the poet's imagination—which they are likely to do in any case—or whether some general tendencies are discernible in all cases. With this end in view, I have investigated so far a substantial part of the life-work of the following poets: Longfellow, William Morris, Oscar Wilde, and four 'decadents' of the 1890's: Dowson, Phillips, Arthur Symons, and Lord Alfred Douglas;¹ also, though more perfunctorily, one or two foreign poets. It will be noted that the above series is deliberately heterogeneous; it contains poets belonging to different times, areas, and aesthetic orientation. While this is only a modest beginning, it is already remarkable that a fairly substantial measure of uniformity has been perceptible in three respects:

(1) *Hierarchical distribution*. Both Gomboez and Dromard² had assumed *a priori* that transfers would most frequently be directed from the lower and less differentiated levels of the sensorium towards the higher ones; thus 'warm colour' sounds more natural than 'coloured warmth', and 'shrill colour' than 'black silence' (used in Wilde's *Salome*, p. 44, in the Albatross edition). Hence the unnatural effect of images like 'green thirst', 'white music' (E. Dowson, *Pierrot*), and 'green cool song' (A. Symons, *Intermezzo-Pastoral*, I). This *a priori* assumption has been borne out convincingly by the numerical results obtained for the poets under review. The cumulative results are so far as follows:

Author	Natural examples	Converse examples
Longfellow	78	26
Morris	279	23
Wilde	337	77
Decadents	335	75

An analysis of the above figures shows that the ratio obtaining between 'normal' and 'anomalous' transfers is by no means constant; it is 3 : 1 in the first case, over 12 : 1 in the second, and less than 5 : 1 in the third and fourth. The almost identical ratio obtained for Wilde and his disciples is not without interest. Yet the very marked differences do not invalidate the main contention that synaesthetic transfers tend to point upwards instead of downwards—at least in the authors examined to date. Once this basic requirement is complied with a substantial margin of liberty is left to each poet or school to model the material as best he likes. If an author has a predominantly visual imagination, the visual sphere will play an important part in contributing adjectives and other material for the depicting of different sensations. Since the visual sphere is at the very top of the sensorium, all visual transfers will have to go downhill, and this will affect the balance, as it did in Longfellow, without, however, radically impairing the hierarchic regularity. If a poet or a movement delight in olfactory sensations, as did the symbolists, this will result in a marked increase in the number of scent transfers.³

¹ The papers dealing with each individual poet can be found at the following places: Longfellow, loc. cit.; Morris, *University of Budapest Studies in English Philology*, II (1937), 143–51; Wilde, *E.St.* LXXII (1938), 245–56; the four Decadents, *Archivum Philologicum* (1939), pp. 173–81.

² Gomboez, op. cit. p. 83; Dromard, 'Les Transpositions sensorielles dans la langue littéraire' (*Journal de Psychologie*, II, 492).

³ Cf. the organ of perfumes in Huysmans, *A Rebours*. For the influence of this book on 'Dorian Gray', see W. Fischer, 'The Poisonous Book' in Oscar Wilde's *Dorian Gray* (*E.St.* LI, 37), and B. Fehr, 'Das gelbe Buch in Oscar Wildes "Dorian Gray"' (*E.St.* LV, 237). A similar fad is recorded by June E. Downey in *Creative Imagination* (London, 1929), p. 95. Cf. also E. v. Erhardt-Siebold in *P.M.L.A.* XLVIII, 577 ff.

It is only by comparing widely different and unconnected writers with each other that one can hope to separate the essential and universal features of synaesthesia from its accidental traits which depend on the poet's mood, outlook, and mental make-up.

In assessing the value of the hierarchic formula which has been found valid for the seven poets under discussion, it must also be borne in mind that visual transfers, which are by definition 'downward' ones, are not always genuine synaesthesias. It was shown above that the intermingling of sensations may be due. (a) to a *tertium comparationis* between their features or their psychological effects, (b) to their co-existence in one single perception. These are, however, two entirely distinct types of semantic change. The former is a transfer of names due to an association of *similarity* between the senses attaching to them; the latter is a transfer of names due to an association of *contiguity* between the senses. The result is identical in both cases, but the psychological factors involved are different, and only the former can be said to reflect synaesthetic associations. Perceptual contiguity yields no metaphors, all that happens is that a paratactic construction is changed into a more concise and intricate hypotactic structure designed to emphasize the indissoluble unity of the whole perception. When, in *Terre promise*, Dowson speaks of 'the fragrant darkness of her hair' instead of 'the fragrance and darkness of her hair', no synaesthetic assimilation underlies his image. This is, of course, a genetic or diachronic point of view which must not be allowed to interfere with the descriptive analysis of synchronic material; but it must be taken into account in the final appraisal of the hierarchic regularity.

(2) *Destination*. While we know from the foregoing the general trend of distribution governing synaesthetic transfer, and while such statistical data as have been compiled to date seem to corroborate the *a priori* conjectures of some scholars and the instinctive impressions of any outside observer, it is extremely unlikely that the second regularity which seems to be emerging from the material collected could have been guessed by such a method. There is, in fact, nothing to tell us which of the upper strata of the sensorium will be particularly in need of such borrowings, and whether there will be any privileged layer at all. Thus, when it was first found that the *acoustic sphere* is the predominant recipient, the temptation was great to attribute this fact to the mental make-up of the poet concerned, to the primarily 'auditive' character of his imagination. But this individualistic interpretation broke down when Oscar Wilde, a visual poet if there ever was one,¹ showed the same distribution: 227 transfers into the acoustic sphere, out of a total of 414, and against 100 transfers into the visual domain. Wilde's disciples and the other poets examined yielded substantially similar results; Morris, 189 out of 302; Longfellow, 73 out of 104. Should the same regularity prevail in the course of future investigations, one might perhaps hazard the suggestion that of the two spheres eligible as recipients under the 'hierarchic distribution law', acoustic terminology is less differentiated than the visual one, less lavishly provided with adjectives and imagery, and therefore more in need of borrowings from other spheres.

(3) *Source*. All the authors investigated show that among the lower levels of the sensorium, *touch* is the main source from which transfers are made upwards.

¹ E. Müller, *Oscar Wilde. Wesen und Stil* (Diss. Zürich, 1934), pp. 52 f., goes as far as to assert that with Wilde, 'visual impressions were the only genuine ones, the only ones reproduced from direct experience', whereas all the re-

mainer were 'intellectual'. On 'imaginal' and 'conceptual' synaesthesia, see E. v. Erhardt-Siebold, loc. cit. p. 588; J. E. Downey, op. cit. p. 94, and W. Silz, loc. cit. p. 470.

This may have its psycho-biological explanation in the part played by touch in the intellectual development and spatial orientation of the child; it may also be partly due to the workings of the hierarchical system itself, considering that touch is so situated as to direct all its transfers necessarily upwards, in the 'right' direction. We have seen, however, that this argument does not work in the case of termini, where sight would present an ideal destination right at the top of the ladder, and yet sound prevails over it and thereby gives rise to 'anomalous' transfers from sight down to sound.

Instead of giving figures for the preponderance of touch as point of departure, I shall conclude my tentative survey of synaesthetic regularities by combining Rules 2 and 3 into one Corollary. If touch is the chief purveyor, and sound the chief consignee, then transfers from touch to sound should be by far the most frequent of the thirty possible cases. This inference is fully confirmed by numerical evidence: 131 out of 302 in Morris, 89 out of 414 in Wilde, 36 out of 104 in Longfellow. The ratio differs in each case, but the frequency of the chief category is everywhere overwhelming.

IV

The foregoing analysis is of course nothing but a beginning, and far more work must be done before it can be set up as a 'law'. But should further research reveal the same regularities, we would obviously be faced with a new type of linguistic law: a *panchronic statistical law*, permitting predictions irrespective of space and time, not about the character of any individual transfer, but about the average behaviour of a large number of phenomena. It is quite possible that even then our panchronic regularity may not be all-pervasive; we may come across exceptions which will have to be accounted for; our law may prove applicable only to a certain range of languages with a common literary inheritance and tradition of style; there may even be a time limit to its applicability: it may be found, for example, that the aesthetic changes brought about by the twentieth century may have revolutionized standards of style to such an extent as to supersede the hierarchic scheme of sense transfers. But even with all these limitations, the range of our law, provided that it turns out to be a law, will be incomparably wider than the orthodox type.

At the time when linguistics was formulating its own basic principles, with its eye on natural science as an ideal model, even this extended form of linguistic law would have appeared narrow and inaccurate in comparison to the universal laws of Nature. But since then, modern science has undergone a tremendous change which is still in full swing. Statistical laws, which were devised originally for phenomena like the Brownian movement, where the behaviour of individual particles was inaccessible to observation, and only the resultant of many thousands of component movements could be calculated, have considerably grown in importance since Planck's quantum theory struck the first blow at orthodox determinism. Bohr's model of the atom, which underlies the whole of modern microphysics, deliberately refrained from making any forecasts as to the further fate of the electrons rotating in their orbits.¹ This trend towards indeterminacy,

¹ 'Another unsatisfactory feature of Bohr's atom is that it contains within itself no prophecy of its future. If we are given a complete specification of the Bohr atom at any instant, we cannot deduce from that specification what the atom is

going to do next. We do not know when an electron will jump or where it will jump to.' J. W. N. Sullivan, *The Bases of Modern Science*, p. 194.

further developed by Heisenberg, has culminated in Dirac's indeterministic views which Sir James Jeans has summed up in these words: 'In other words, when we are dealing with atoms and electrons in crowds, the mathematical law of averages imposes the determinism which physical laws have failed to provide.'¹ Obviously, there is still a wide gulf between the statistical laws of language and of natural science. It would be futile to expect that linguistics may attain the degree of accuracy foreshadowed by Dirac: 'This probability the theory enables one to calculate. In special cases the probability may be unity, and the result of the experiment is then quite determinate' (*ibid.*). The most a linguist can hope for is to establish a general probability and a rough indication of the measure of probability. This is inherent in the indeterminate character of the act of speech itself.² Yet, within the inevitable limitations of his peculiar branch of study, the linguist may legitimately claim—in case a panchronic type of law can be set up alongside the traditional type—that by a mutual shift nearer each other, the gap between the two extreme cases, the statistical laws of language and the statistical laws of nature, is appreciably narrower than the gulf separating the space-time laws of language from the absolute laws of positive science.

STEPHEN DE ULLMANN

CAVERSHAM

¹ Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*, p. 42. On statistical laws in science, see the opening chapters of L. Infeld, *The World in Modern Science. Matter and Quanta* (London, 1934).

² '...we should still be unable to measure the equipment each speaker brought with him, and unable, therefore, to predict what speech-forms he would utter, or, for that matter, whether he would utter any speech at all' (L. Bloomfield, *Language*, p. 141).

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

THE ITALIAN EDITION OF BOCCACCIO'S 'FIAMMETTA' USED BY BARTHOLOMEW YOUNG

So popular was *Fiammetta* in Italy and so numerous were the editions of this work that at first sight it appears almost impossible to decide which of them came into the hands of Bartholomew Young. Obviously the one that he had before him must have been printed earlier than 1587, when the English version was published. But we are still left with a large choice. Some of the earliest editions came from the press of the famous Giunta family at Florence, first Filippo and then Bernardo. In 1540 another edition was printed at Venice by Giovanni Padovano. Following the example set by Bernardo di Giunta in his edition of 1533, it included a preface, by Tizzone Gaetano. Two years after the edition of Giovanni Padovano the first of a long series of editions was issued by Gabriele Giolito de' Ferrari. The later ones which I have seen bear the dates 1545, 1551, 1557, 1558, 1562, 1565, 1577 and 1578. All these were published at Venice and all contain a preface by Gabriele Giolito. This preface was retained in the edition printed at Venice in 1584 by Fabio and Agostin Zoppini, and in that which came from the press of Gio. Battista Bonsadio in the same city in 1586. On the other hand, in the edition printed there by the Gioliti in 1586 the preface is by Giovanni Giolito. Finally, reference must be made to the French translation of 1585 by Gabriel Chappuys which also gave the Italian text but not the preface of Gabriele Giolito.

This last-mentioned preface was retained by Young. Hence those editions in which it is not found need not be considered further. Another feature of Young's translation which serves as a useful guide is the marginal notes or 'postille' that summarize the contents of the work step by step. These occur from 1557 onwards but not in the editions of 1542, 1545 and 1551, which can therefore be eliminated.

An examination of the 'postille' furnishes still more valuable data. In Book VII Young has two marginal notes, 'French rimes' and 'The second feuers hurt more then the first', corresponding to 'Romanzi Franceschi' and 'Le seconde febbre più offendono che le premiere', which are lacking in the editions of 1557 and 1586 (Bonsadio).

Consequently, setting aside these two editions, we need only take account of those which appeared in 1558, 1562, 1565, 1577, 1578 and 1584. They may be divided into two groups. One, containing the editions of 1562, 1577, 1578 and 1584, has in Book VI the marginal note 'Cose impossibili' after 'Costume di chi dubita'; the other, limited to the editions of 1558 and 1565, reverses this order. Young's translation agrees with the second group, and so we may conclude that his text was one of these, or possibly some other edition which I have not seen and which embodies the features peculiar to them.

In dealing with the 'postille' Young takes many liberties. He makes numerous omissions and also some additions. In particular, he inserts in the margin the names of classical personages alluded to in the text, and repeatedly he draws the reader's attention to Naples, when the city is mentioned. Occasionally, he adds such a note as 'Venus doth appeare vnto her' (Book I) or 'Fiammettas prayer to Venus' (Book IV). Sometimes the notes that he contributes are intended to explain the subject-matter. Thus in Book V he informs us, rather unnecessarily, that 'Posthumus is he that is borne after his Fathers death', and towards the end of Book IV that

'The vppermost attire of Italian & Spanish Ladies, and Gentlewomenne is a fine blacke mantle of silke or Saye vpon their other garments which couereth thē from the hand to the feete'. Akin to this last procedure is his amplification of 'Discriptione de' giostranti' somewhat earlier in the same book, so that in his version we read 'A discription of Tylt and giuoco di canne, much vsed of the Spaniards, Italians and Mores'. In other respects Young is content to follow the marginal notes of the Italian text. However, it may be observed that he is not always accurate. To take only two examples. In Book III he renders 'Gli antichi segnauano i giorni con pietre' rather strangely by 'Lovers mark their daies with stones', and 'I uani ragionamenti scemano le noie' by 'Variety of talke doth diminish sorrow and sadnes'.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT

BANGOR

AN ALLUSION TO THE ROMANCE OF 'PARTONOPE OF BLOIS' IN THE
FIFTEENTH-CENTURY TALE OF GUISCARDO AND GHISMONDA

MS. R. 3. 19 at Trinity College, Cambridge, contains a story in verse about Guiscardo and Ghismonda, the lovers in the first tale of the fourth day of the *Decameron*. The opening lines of the sixth stanza, which praise the fairness of the heroine, run thus:

She excellyd in bewte the Ipermy[s]ture,
Penelope of grece and eke the fayre Elien,
Ipolita also and Emly hyr systure,
Meliorir and Vrake, and also Poli[x]ene.

At the time when I edited this text (*Early English Versions of the Tales of Guiscardo and Ghismonda and Titus and Gisippus*, London, 1937), I was unable to make anything of 'Meliorir' and 'Vrake', and in view of the context assumed that they were corruptions of classical names. I now realize that 'Meliorir' is a scribal error for 'Melior', the queen of Byzantium who possessed magical powers. The romance of *Partonope of Blois* describes how the hero is estranged from Melior but is cared for by her sister, the wise Urake, until the lovers are reunited. A lengthy tribute to the beauty of Melior and Urake occurs at the end of the work.¹ The English version is preserved in five manuscripts, all of which belong to the fifteenth century. The Trinity College manuscript is of the same period, and it is likely that the metrical version of Guiscardo and Ghismonda was composed some time between 1450 and 1500. From all this it may perhaps be concluded that the popularity of *Partonope of Blois* was at its height in the fifteenth century.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT

BANGOR

MORE NOTES ON CHAPMAN'S PLAYS
(See Vol. XXXIII, no. 2, April 1938)

I. Comedies

An Humourous Day's Mirth, Sc. 7, 201

And she as I hope wel observed hath uttered many kind conceits of hers.

Dr Parrott alters this, in order to 'make the speech intelligible'. But as it stands, Lemot only exaggerates Martia's two 'kind conceits' into 'many', and hopes they have been noticed.

¹ See the edition of A. T. Bodtker, London, 1912, ll. 11456-11481 and 11495-11500.

All Fools, iv, 1, 31

Honest Credulity is a true loadstone to draw on Deceprity,
For the last word read 'Deception'.

Ibid. iv, 1, 60

My circumstance lessening the fact.

Parrott manages to extract some sense from this, but 'countenance' would make all clear.

Ibid. iv, 1, 374

Ye shall see if like two parts in me, I leave not both these gentlemen's wits imbrired.
Parrott quotes and rejects several suggestions. Here is one more: 'two parts in one', musical parts, tangled in counterpoint.

The Gentleman Usher, iii, 2, 124

I will still be plain, since I am true. Come, let us lie a little;
I am weary.

Parrott ignores the equivoque in 'true' and 'lie'.

Ibid. iv, 3, 73

I know,
Many things shown me from the open'd skies
That pass all arts.

Read 'Art', regularly used of the art medical, as in iv, 1, 31, v, 4, 122 and the famous *Ars longa, vita brevis* of Hippocrates, and Johnson's lines on Levett. Final *s* is a slippery letter.

May-Day, i, 1, 42

Lor. A nose made out of wax.
Ang. A red nose, in sincerity.

A glance at the long-accepted derivation of *sincerus*, *sine cera*.

Ibid. i, 1, 633

My Valentine.

Not otherwise mentioned, says Parrott. But surely this is the tailor's wife of whom Quintiliano has been bragging.

The Widow's Tears, i, 3, 32

All things by strife engender.

Cf. i, 2, 149. Heraclitus's maxim $\delta \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon\iota\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\rho$, which Chapman would have found in Erasmus's *Adages*, iii, 5, 36. In *Chabot*, v, 2, the saying is given a comic twist, *omnia ex lite fieri*, especially lawyers: 'we are all made by law'.

Ibid. i, 3, 119

Let not your near honours change your manners.

The old tag *honores mutant mores*, for which King, *Classical Quotations*, no. 1365, gives only the French.

Ibid. iii, 2, 77

There be that your cheer;
Love with your husband be your wisdom here.

'There' and 'here' are contrasted. Cynthia's 'cloudy looks' would suit the tomb she speaks of visiting; but now she should show her wisdom in loving her husband.

The Widow's Tears, iv, 2, 41

Well said, 'tis well.

As nothing has been said, the phrase clearly has the sense well illustrated by Nares of 'well done'.

Ibid. iv, 3, 145

There's no guaiacum here.

As Ero is praising the 'medicine', and guaiacum was highly esteemed, is not this the ironical use found in *Eastward-Ho*, iii, 2, 62, 'There's no base fellow'? See Nares on 'Here's no'.

Sir Giles Goosecap, ii, 1, 48

Ulciscere inimicos, sed sine tuo incommodo.

From Menander,

ἐχθροὺς ἀμύνου μὴ 'πὶ τῇ σπαντοῦ βλάβῃ.

Ibid. ii, 1, 132

This kind conjuration even fires it out of me.

Chapman's hand is suggested by the figurative use of 'fire out'. Cf. *M. d'Olive*, v, 1, 12, and *May-Day*, i, 1, 129. 'Flow' for 'abound' in l. 265 is also a pet usage.

Ibid. ii, 1, 175

Blood (whose bitterness *santitas et non nobilitas efficit*).

Read 'betterness', a word used by Chapman in the Commentary to *Iliad* ii.

Ibid. ii, 1, 291

He should be put up for concealment.

'Indicted for the suppression of facts', says Parrott. He might have referred to Nares for the origin of the phrase, the things concealed being ecclesiastical property under Henry VIII.

Ibid. iv, 1, 199

Why, this is plain, dishonoured deceit.

For this active use of 'dishonoured' see *Iliad* xiv, 284, and the Argument to *Iliad* iv, where Pandarus 'Gives Menelaus a dishonoured wound'.

Ibid. iv, 3, 5-12

My lord, I feel a treble happiness
Mix in one soul, which proves how eminent
Things endless are above things temporal
That are in bodies needfully confined:
I cannot suffer their dimensions pierc'd,
Where my immortal part admits expansure,
Even to the comprehension of two more
Commix'd substantially with her mere self.

Bodies have extension, divisibility, and impenetrability, the last meaning that no two bodies can occupy the same space. But Clarence's soul can entertain in itself his lady and his friend. For the meaningless 'I' in l. 9 read 'And'.

Ibid. v, 2, 61

Pythagoras' golden rule:

Maxime omnium teipsum reverere.

A Latin version of the twelfth of the so-called 'Golden Verses of Pythagoras'.

II. Tragedies

Bussy D'Ambois, I, 2, 168

Why, here's the lion, scared with the throat of a dunghill cock.

The antipathy is recorded by Aelian, *Nat. Anim.* III, 31. Chapman returns to the notion in *Eugenia*, 864.

Ibid. I, 2, 196

Was that the subject of your ridiculous jollity?

For 'ridiculous' = derisive, see *Odyssey* XX, 282, of the Suitors.

Ibid. II, 1, 51

Pyrrho's opinion.

Given by Stobaeus, *Flor.* 121, 28, μηδὲν διαφέρειν ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι. Cf. *infra*, v, 4, 95, 'The equal thought I have of life and death'.

Ibid. II, 1, 174-6

But my friend only sav'd his fame's dear life,
Which is above life, taking th' undervalue,
Which, in the wrong it did, was forfeit to him.

The under value is Barrisor's life—less precious than fame—forfeit to Bussy through Barrisor's insults.

Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, I, 1, 103

Her rosy eyes.

Is this an anticipation of the red-eyed Revenge invoked by Tamyra in I, 2, 1?

Ibid. I, 1, 107

On needles' points

My wife's heart stands with haste of the revenge.

Cf. *Iliad*, XIX, 137, 'Though never so on thorns thy mind stands to thy friend's revenge'.

Ibid. II, 1, 112

Chapman could have read Sophocles's *Antigone* in Thomas Watson's Latin version of 1581, but the Latin in his note on l. 136 is neither Watson's nor that of Erasmus in the *Adages*.

Ibid. III, 1, 42

There was a merit for this, in the fault
That Bussy made.

With this use of 'merit' for 'just cause' compare the use of 'deserts' in I, 2, 77.

Ibid. III, 2, 41-4

Demetrius Phalereus, an orator...

So great in Athens grew that he erected
Three hundred statues of him.

For that absurd 'he' Parrott rejects 'she' = Athens; then surely he should print 'they' = the Athenians.

Ibid. III, 2, 107

No time occurs to kings.

This is the legal maxim *nullum tempus occurrit regi*, no lapse of time can impair his rights.

Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, v, 2, 13

Her thundery stoop (of the eagle).

Sylvester has 'the falcon stooping thunderlike', and Tennyson wrote 'like a thunderbolt he falls', but Apuleius, *Florida* 2, comes first: 'quaerat quorsum potissimum in praedam superne se proruat fulminis vice.'

Byron's Conspiracy, i, 2, 7

That so I may not seem an idle spot
In tram of this ambassage.

Cf. *The Widow's Tears*, i, 2, 20, 'as spots in his train'. The metaphor seems to be drawn from the peacock's spotted appendage.

Ibid. ii, 2, 67

The Duke Byron, on his brave beast Pastrana,
Who sits him like a full-sail'd Argosy
Danc'd with a lofty billow.

Cf. *Two Noble Kinsmen*, ii, 2, 23, 'O never shall we two . . . feel our fiery horses like proud seas under us'.

Ibid. iii, 1, 55

So all things here
Have all their price set down from men's conceits
Which make all terms and actions good or bad.

Cf. *Caesar and Pompey*, iii, 1, 39, 'Who cares for up or down where all's but thought?' *Hamlet*, ii, 2, 225, 'For there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so'.

Ibid. iii, 2, 165

My face and all my lineaments.

This use of 'lineament' for 'limb', not allowed by *N.E.D.*, is very frequent in the Homer, and cf. *Caesar and Pompey*, iv, 2, 23.

Ibid. iii, 3, 52

Caput Algol.

At the end of his notes to the fourth book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Sandys mentions the association of this evil omen with Byron.

Ibid. iii, 3, 59

Ignorance is an idle salve for ill.

From Seneca, *Oedipus* 515, 'Iners malorum remedium ignorantia est'.

Ibid. iv, 1, 113, 114

You make all stale before
Utterly obsolete; all to come, twice sod.

For the proverbial *bis coctus*, twice dished-up and therefore stale, see Erasmus's *Adages*, i, 5, 38, and *N.E.D.* s.v. Colewort.

Ibid. v, 1, 5

The simile is evidently borrowed from the end of the Sixth *Iliad*, Paris going to the fight.

Ibid. v, 1, 147-51

I alone

Took Amiens in these arms, and held her fast
In spite of all the pitchy fires she cast...
Till she show'd yours, and took her natural form.

The siege of Amiens is compared to Menelaus's struggle with Proteus, only ended when the god resumed his natural form.

Byron's *Tragedy*, I, 1, 148

From Hector's prayer for his infant son at the end of the Sixth *Iliad*.

Ibid. I, 2, 12

Winters of shot.

Cf. Statius, *Thebaid*, v, 386, *ferrea hiems*.

Ibid. I, 2, 30

On our chaos

Will I sit brooding up another world.

One of many references to Genesis i, 2. Byron profanely compares himself to the Holy Ghost, who 'dove-like satst brooding on the vast abyss, and madst it pregnant' (*Paradise Lost*, I, 21). St Basil has *incubabat* where the Vulgate has *ferebatur*, and the A.V. 'moved'.

Ibid. I, 2, 38

And how far short of this is my recompense.

Read 'And how far short of his my recompense!'

Ibid. iv, 2, 173

Will you become as wilful as your friend,
And draw a mortal justice on your heads,
That hangs so black and is so loath to strike?

For the quite pointless 'black' read 'back'.

Chabot, I, 1, 48

The chilindre or pocket sun-dial mentioned by Chaucer and Lydgate evidently had a magnetic needle attached to ensure right placing. Cf. *The Widow's Tears*, II, 3, 5.

Ibid. I, 1, 150

He takes his top-sail down in such rough storms.

An intentional contrast with Byron's outburst in *Byron's Conspiracy*, III, 3, 135.

Ibid. I, 1, 220

Loud conscience has a voice to shudder greatness.

Parrott's correction of 'shadder', and Christopher North's 'the nod that shuddered Olympus' should be added to *N.E.D.*'s nonce-use (from Blake) of a transitive verb 'shudder'.

Ibid. I, 1, 190

Circles being called ambitious lines.

There is no doubt about this literal use of 'ambitious', though *N.E.D.* knows it not. See *Hero and Leander*, v, 427, 'Come, come, dear Night, Love's mart of kisses, Sweet close of his ambitious line'. *Achilles' Shield*, 153, 'He [Vulcan] three ambitious circles cast'. Cf. *Poetaster*, v, 1, 29.

Chabot, II, 1, 49

Madam, you are the soul of our great work.

The use of 'soul' for leading spirit is not given by *N.E.D.* See also *Guiana*, 153, where Raleigh is called 'the soul of this exploit'. Mme de Sévigné has *L'âme de l'entreprise*.

Ibid. III, 1, 191

Truth sits not on her square more firm than he.

Parrott has not recognized the frequency of this figure in Chapman. To his one example add *Caesar and Pompey*, III, 1, 36, and *Odyssey*, VIII, 230, 'words that fall (Like dice) upon the square still'. The origin seems to be Hierocles's remark that Socrates's discourses were like dice, that always stand upright, whatever way they fall. But Chapman may have got it from Erasmus's *Adages*, IV, 8, 35, on *Quadratus homo*, Aristotle's *τετράγωνος*.

Ibid. IV, 1, 31-5

The king's reply to this speech is addressed to Montmorency, whom it would suit better than it does the queen.

Ibid. IV, 1, 426-33

Parrott notes that the simile is eminently in Chapman's manner. Of course it is, for it recurs in the Dedication of the *Odyssey* to Somerset, and of the *Hesiod* to Bacon.

Ibid. V, 2, 180

The mouse who begged to be banished into a Parmesan is clearly some relation of La Fontaine's rat who desired *se retirer dans un fromage de Hollande*; and D'Avenant's prologue to *The Siege of Rhodes* (part II) ends, 'Like an old rat retire to parmezan'.

Ibid. V, 3, 226-9

Kings, they say,

Die not, or starve succession: Oh why

Should that stand firm, and kings themselves despair

To find their subject still in the next heir?

The next heir is the subject's, and he cannot be depended on to reproduce the virtues of him he succeeds; whereas a successor to a king is always available.

Caesar and Pompey, II, 2, 20-33

For this lion simile Parrott gives two sources, but it is even more composite than that. The *Iliad* XVII, 108 supplied 'lets his rough brows down so low they cover all his eyes'; and the barking heart comes from *Odyssey* XX, 14, where Ulysses is compared to a watch-dog.

Ibid. II, 3, 68-70

'Tis offer'd, sir, above the rate of Caesar

In other men, but, in what I approve,

Beneath his merits.

Others may deem the terms too favourable to Caesar, but to judge by my experience of him they are less than he deserves—a very tangled sentence.

Ibid. iv, 1, 21-3

What's infinitely more—thus wild, thus mad,
For one poor fortune of a beaten few
To half so many staid and dreadful soldiers.

For 'beaten' = veteran see *The Widow's Tears*, i, 3, 148. The recent success of Pompey's few veterans against half as many of Caesar's formidable men had maddened the crowd of novices in Pompey's camp.

Ibid. v, 1, 212-14

And, for earthly greatness,
All heavenly comforts rarefies to air.
I'll therefore live in dark.

Simpler than Parrott's explanation is to shift the comma from after 'greatness' to after 'air', and take 'for' as 'because'.

Ibid. v, 1, 262

To my former note on this add a reference to Erasmus's *Adages*, II, 7, 24, *Nunc dei beati*, with the line θεοὶ δ' ὄνειδος τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

Alphonsus, III, 1, 129

It sets my teeth an edge.

Parrott tries to distinguish this, meaning 'it gives me an appetite', from the ordinary 'to set one's teeth on edge', but the form is indifferent, as in the parallel case of 'an end' and 'on end'. *N.E.D.* does not recognize the meaning here, though Autolycus has it.

GEORGE G. LOANE

STROUD

WHY GOETHE ALTERED FAUST'S CHRISTIAN NAME

In his edition of Goethe's *Urfaust* and *Faust, ein Fragment*, the most notable British contribution to the study of *Faust* in recent years, Professor Willoughby raises the question why Goethe changed Faust's traditional name of Johann to Heinrich. Rightly brushing aside several previous theories, he suggests that Goethe may have discarded the name of Johann because it was his own and might have rendered the 'confession' too obvious. There seems to me, however, to have been a more potent reason for the change.

In the eighteenth century the name of Johann had sunk very low. In comedies it was the usual name of the manservant, until it became almost a synonym of 'coachman'. That this continued up to our own times could be proved by quotations from *Fliegende Blätter* and other German comic journals, while one of the best examples is provided by Detlev von Liliencron in the first stanza of his poem 'Nach dem Balle':

Setz in des Wagens Finsternis
Getrost den Atlasschuh!
Die Fuchse schäumen ins Gebiß,¹
Und nun, Johann, fahr zu!

It may be noted that the shortened form 'Jahn' sank even lower, as is seen from words such as *Jahnhaegel* (*Jahnageß*), *Dammerjan*, *Dummrian*, *Grobjan*, *Schlendrian*,

¹ The chestnut horses are coming at their bits.

Stolprian, and that the English and French equivalents Johnny and Jean fared no better.

Faust's christian name occurs only five times in *Faust*, Part I, and not at all in Part II; and is only used by Gretchen:

Gretchen. Versprich mir, Heinrich! (3413)

Dir Heinrich, muß es auch so sein. (3500)

Du gehst nun fort? O Heinrich, könnt' ich mit. (4542)

Heinrich! Mir graut's vor dir. (4612)

and the last words of the drama

Heinrich! Heinrich! (4612)

One has but to substitute 'Johann' in any of these lines, and particularly in the last two, to realize that if addressed to 'Johann' they would completely destroy the tragic atmosphere and at performances would be sure to evoke peals of laughter.

It would be futile to speculate why Goethe should have chosen the name of Heinrich. It was a good old German name and probably had pleasant associations for him, as it was the name of his great Strassburg friend Jung-Stilling.

H. G. FIEDLER

OXFORD

REVIEWS

A Philological Miscellany presented to Eilert Ekwall. Edited by S. B. LILJEGREN and J. MELANDER. Uppsala: A. B. Lundquistska Bokhandeln. 1942. 426 + 250 pp.

In 1942 a great Swedish scholar, Professor Eilert Ekwall of Uppsala, celebrated his sixty-fifth birthday. To mark the occasion no less than fifty-nine friends and colleagues drawn from the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, the United States, France and Germany among others, have presented him with an imposing miscellany which constitutes vol. XIV and vol. XV (1-250) of *Studia Neophilologica*. The volume is adorned with an excellent photograph. The articles reflect Ekwall's many-sided interests. Many are concerned with English language and literature, others including Old Norse, Middle Low German, Old French and Old Portuguese studies. As much useful matter is apt to be sunk without a trace in a foreign miscellany an attempt will be made to indicate briefly the contents of the various articles, classified into compartments by no means watertight, but conducive to easier reference. The bracketed number after each contributor's name gives the page with which the article begins; a proposed II shows that it belongs to the newly paginated second part.

A. LINGUISTIC

(1) *General theory and description*

O. Funke (II 15) shows how in England the philosophy of language develops from Wallis's Grammar (1653) and Wilkins's Essay (1668) through Harris's *Hermes* (1751) and Lowth's *Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762) to Priestley's *Theory of Language and Universal Grammar*.

G. Stern (II 1) tries to amend Bühler's classification of constitutive speech functions into *Ausdruck*, *Appell*, *Darstellung* (Stern: expressive, effective and symbolic functions respectively) by substituting the 'communicative' function for the 'effective', which Stern alleges to be the primary purpose of speech itself.

Fr. Klaeber (II 135) endorses Heusler's suggestion that the older Germanic dialects are predominantly 'nominal' (substantival and adjectival) in structure by adducing examples from Gothic, Old English and Old High German.

(2) *Phonology*

(a) *Indo-European*: A. Cuny (II 230) treats the complicated problem of the transference to vowels of the reconstructed IE laryngals ə_1 , ə_2 and ə_3 such as are assumed for Lat. *avis*, *aurōra*, etc.

(b) *English*: F. Schubel (255) shows that OE *sc-* did not pass into [ʃ] till the eleventh century.

A. Gabrielson (331) compares the readings of the first two editions (1619, 1621) of Gill's *Logonomia Anglica* with a view to supplementing Jiriczek's edition in *Quellen und Forschungen*, xc.

Astrid Sturzen-Becker (301) gives useful notes on English pronunciations recorded in William Pelham's *System of Notation* (1808).

W. Horn (238) explains the modern pronunciation of *one*, *none*, *nothing* by postulating a lowering of tone, whereas the long sound in *don't* presupposes level or falling-rising intonation.

(c) *Romanic*: E. Slettengren (369) discusses the ME variant *diol* (OFr *due*[i]l) in South-Eastern MS. Auchinleck (first hand) of about 1330, adducing evidence for the pronunciation of OFr *-uel* in Anglo-French.

G. Tilander (II 191) investigates OPort *miana* < *miona* < *mea domina*.

J. Meländer (II 183) relates the vowel of It. *del(lo)*, *nel(lo)* to *e* < unstressed *i* in *nemico* < *inimico*, *spedal*, cf. *nel cuóre*.

(3) *Accidence*

(a) *Germanic*: J. Fourquet (420), undertaking a fresh analysis of OE *ēode* and *dyde*, suggests that the weak preterite in Germanic shows a consonantal enlargement of the present stem (cf. Lat. *fē-c-ī*, *scrip-s-ī*, etc.) and suspects influence of verbal adjectives in *-to*.

(b) *English*: E. Rooth (71) shows how the use of *-ing* for the present participle in place of OE *-nde* has been furthered by two convergent processes, (i) functional convergence of infinitive and verbal abstract in *-ing* and (ii) phonetic convergence of dat. inf. *-enne* with participial *-ende*.

(c) *French*: Carl Collin (II 179) shows that the supersession of the past subjunctive in spoken French is helped by the fact that with verbs of the regular *-ir* conjugation the only point of difference between past and present of the subjunctive lies in the 3rd person singular.

(4) *Syntax*

U. Ohlander (58) surveys the ME use (or omission) of the infinitive sign *to* especially with volitional verbs in various groupings.

C. A. Bodelsen (393) adduces good examples of *shall* in the 2nd and 3rd persons of the future, the added implication being 'certainty of fulfilment' or dependence on somebody's will. To the reviewer even *your socks shall follow* (396) sounds normal if the speaker wishes to indicate his concern for their dispatch.

Asta Kihlbom (412) discusses with acumen the use of *should* in subordinate clauses of time, especially those introduced by *till*, *until*, *before*, *when*.

(5) *Vocabulary (including word formation)*

(a) *English*: T. Johannisson (214) shows that OE *incūð* does not contain a supposed privative *in-*, but represents the pret. part. of a verb **inkūnnan*, cf. *fracoð*.

H. Pedersen (252) thinks that *wīf* in *wīfmon* comes from a stem meaning a woman's garment, thus paralleling *wæpenmon* for a man.

K. F. Sundén (281) in his notes on Layamon's *Brut* after expressing the view that the poem was written in north Worcestershire (where the West Saxon Hwicce had come under the Angles) appends etymologies of *keppe*, *tisdæi*, *akimed*—all Scandinavian—*toswadd* and *weizes*.

M. T. Löfvenberg (86) differentiates ME *aubel* 'white poplar' and *ebel* 'dane wort' (now East Anglian for 'wayfaring tree'), both from *Promptorium Parvulorum*.

F. Behre (221) derives the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον *stoke* 'to flee' in Thomas Castleford's Chronicle from Old WN *stokkva*, and the phrase *in wight* 'in the balance' from ON *wæht*.

O. S. Anderson (247) collects the ME dialectal equivalents of OE *lȳþre* (cf. G. *liederlich*), the base being **lūþr-* (**liuþr-*).

E. Löfstedt (II 245) traces the use of E *occasion* in the sense of 'cause' to the Latin legal and theological use of *occasio*.

G. Langenfelt (197) connects the English hypocoristic *-s* (e.g. *Babs*) with metonymous plurals like *Bones*, *Boots*, *Buttons*, *Chips*, etc. [Reviewer's note: apparently Scand. *-es*, *-is* has a different history, cf. H. Gering's review of Feilberg's Jutish dictionary in *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Phil.* XLVIII, 296–302.]

(b) *French*: K. Michaëlsson (II 187) explains *car en cosse* (in taxation rolls 1298–9) as a Parisian nickname for a woman wearing a surcoat with buttoned lateral slits.

(c) *German*: A. Lindqvist (II 173) shows that NHG *Ulk* 'a lark' (Low German from 1620) is not from *unluck*, but rather is a verbal substantive from LG *ulken* < *ulk*, diminutive of *ūl* 'owl'.

(6) *Linguistic influence*

T. Dahl (386) shows how Danish adopted and adapted English words from 1800 onwards, including spurious loans like *speaker* 'announcer', *sixpence* 'cloth cap', *smoking*, *kiks* (cf. G. Kekes), *ships* (cf. G. Schlips).

J. Hedberg (340) supplies Hindustani designations of British officials of the type *doctor sahib*, *jungle wallah*, etc.

(7) *Proper names*

(a) *Place-names*: P. H. Reaney (97)—an authority on Cambridgeshire place-names—discusses the ancient names of Fenland rivers.

The late Sir Allen Mawer (89) identifies the *Canning Marsh*, scene of a Danish raid in December 1010, with the western part of the isle of Pewsey (Wilts), shows how a land dispute investigated by King Alfred has left an echo in the names *Mooray* (morgengifu) and *Hindon*, and discusses the site of Wiltshire localities mentioned in the will of the eldest son of Ethelred II.

R. Blenner-Hassett (53) thinks that the Welsh *Aber Llyn Lliwan*, the original of the *mære swiðe muchel* of the *Brut*, is not likely to be found on any map of Britain.

(b) *Personal names*. Bruce Dickins (114) suggests that in *Havelok* the names of Grim's children were introduced by the English author, the name *Wendut*—which implies travel overseas—occurring in the *Miracula S. Thomi* (about 1171).

O. von Friesen (357) discusses Bot-names in northern English with reference to their cognates in other Germanic languages and to their productiveness in the ME period.

F. Paasche (366) shows how the tradition of King *Æpelstān* was preserved in the ON figure *Aðalstein*.

(c) *Tribal names*: M. Vasmer (II 132) relates *Τροῦλοι*—the Vandal name for the Goths—to ON *troll* (cf. MHG *trolle* 'rough fellow', *trulle* 'meretrix', etc.).

B. LITERARY

(1) *Historical and geographical background; biography; literary influences*

F. Gadde (II 71) discusses the contributions of Viktor Rydberg to *Beowulf* research from 1886 to 1889, especially his views concerning Grendel, nature-myths, Breca and the Hærebeald-Hæpcyn episode.

S. B. Liljegen (145) examines critically O. S. Anderson's recent interpretation of *The Seafarer* as a religious allegory of earthly and heavenly life. Having discussed OE imagery, including that culled from the Bible and the Church Fathers (not then become 'cliché'), he suggests that the understanding of the poem is not feasible by purely philological methods, but demands a knowledge of literary implications such as has been shown by Sweet, Ehrismann and Schücking.

R. Ekblom (115) commends Alfred as a geographer in the excursus to *Orosius* and demonstrates the significance of alternative orientations (the normal and the Scandinavian) in appraising the location of the various regions described.

F. P. Magoun, Jr. (1) shows that the Old Norwegian *Lay of Gurun* is the product of some Norman court in Scotland or Galloway and refers to events occurring between 1107 and 1118.

N. Bøgholm (II 41) compares the story told by Chaucer's Franklin with versions in Sanskrit and with Boccaccio.

H. W. Donner (II 43) states the view that in More's *Utopia* the community is governed by the three principles of absolute equality, love of peace and contempt for gold.

Herbert G. Wright (II 105) follows the interest of English writers in Charles XII of Sweden from 1711 (and especially 1717 when there were fears of a Swedish invasion to support the Jacobites), adducing in turn Defoe, Voltaire, Dr Johnson, Goldsmith, Southey, Charles Lamb and Byron. When Planché's drama was produced in 1829 the mighty king had sunk to the figure of a benevolent 'deus ex machina' in a light comedy.

P. H. Elander (II 49) after a review of the evidence concerning Thomas Carlyle's 'religious crisis' dates it in the first half of 1821, fixing the summer as the turning-point. He suggests that more weight be given to the influence of Carlyle's acquaintance with Margaret Gordon of Kirkcaldy.

J. Hankiss (II 30) discusses the culmination of the Ossianic cult in Hungary with special reference to Petöfi's *Homer és Osszián* (1847), Arany's *Ősszel* (1850) and Liszt's essay on Sobolewski's *Vinvela* (1853).

C. Hentschel (II 91) describes John Cowper Powys's interest in German literature, beginning in his school days and devoted particularly to the figure of Gretchen as typifying woman's 'cosmic wisdom' through closeness to nature. Similar elements are traced in the works of Lao Tze, Dorothy Richardson and Dostoevsky.

(2) *Editions of texts*

J. Holmberg (II 157) has increased our gratitude to Swedish scholarship in the MLG field by publishing an Eastfalian Easter poem preserved in two MSS., one in Wolfenbüttel (about 1300) and the other in Hildesheim (fourteenth century).

E. A. Kock (II 141) has edited and translated the so-called Icelandic *Liljukvistur*, lit. lily stalk, a Marianic poem beginning *Giörði í einu*, and has cleared up many obscurities.

E. Walberg (II 209) presents, together with an introduction and notes, a critical text of an unpublished French poem of the fourteenth century, *Histoire du Maistre Silon*, treating of the conversion of a Parisian magister at the end of the eleventh century.

(3) *Textual criticism; interpretation*

F. Dornseiff (II 241) discusses the use of 'flavus' as applied, by Catullus to Berenice's hair, comparing its implications with *ξανθός* as an attribute of womanly beauty.

Kemp Malone (25) demonstrates that to obtain an accurate text of *Beowulf* we should do well to go behind Zupitza's autotypes to the Thorkelin transcripts themselves.

F. Holthausen (160) emends *Beowulf* 461 *gara* to *wigana* (adducing parallels for the substitution of *r* for *n*) and—on the evidence of a photograph—substitutes *heom* for *hit* in l. 3168.

A. E. H. Swaen (67) lists seven different solutions of OE Riddle 9 (6, 8), himself favouring 'bell'.

H. Kökeritz (277) interprets *forþ berað* of Finnsburg Fragment, l. 5a, as 'continue to support' and *bordes* in *Sir Gawain*, l. 1954, as 'maidens'.

S. Singer (31) discusses the *stemma* of MSS. of Hending's proverbs proposed by Schleicher in *Anglia*, LI, 220 ff., and supplies valuable comments and parallels to various proverbs.

A. H. King (161) in a penetrating study of ambiguity in *Henry IV, Part I*, gives many instances of homonymic quibbles (prey / pray), sense-quibbles (the skipping king) and ambiguity by free association (brook → [broke] → brittle).

P. Legouis (184) works out the meaning of certain expressions used by Donne in his satires, and by closely reasoned analyses of the contexts is able to supplement data supplied by the *O.E.D.*

J. Vising (II 195) studies the text of the Anglo-Norman didactic poem *Femina* (about 1400), published by W. Aldis Wright for the Roxburgh Club in 1909, and appends some useful notes on words not listed by Godefroy or Tobler-Lommattsch.

The above abstract is a sufficient indication of the valuable contents of a gift book worthy of the donors and of the recipient. May Professor Ekwall long be spared to delight his many friends and well-wishers with the garnered stores of his own ripe scholarship!

W. E. COLLINSON

LIVERPOOL

Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century. By R. WEISS. Oxford: Blackwell. 1941. xxi+190 pp. 12s. 6d.

This is the fourth volume to appear in the series of Medium Ævum Monographs. It represents a study of the transition from medieval to Renaissance culture in England, the actual treatment, for certain reasons, being limited to the period beginning with the arrival of Poggio in this country (1418) and ending with the accession of Henry VII (1485). The task was well worth undertaking, as apart from Schirmer's interesting monograph, *Der Englische Frühhumanismus* (1931), the subject had previously been but summarily and inadequately treated, in spite of its importance in the history of ideas; and Dr Weiss has succeeded in contributing something of value to the study. He defines, to begin with, that much overworked word 'humanism' as embracing 'the whole range of classical studies and activities as conceived by the Italians from the days of Petrarch', and the 'humanist' as 'the scholar who studied the writings of ancient authors without fear of supernatural anti-Ciceronian warnings, searched for manuscripts of lost or rare classical texts, collected the works of classical writers and attempted to learn Greek and write like the ancient authors of Rome'. Then with this somewhat limited conception of humanism as his touchstone he traces in detail the contributions made by Poggio, by Papal officials in England and Englishmen in Italy, by Humphrey of Gloucester and his circle, by the English pupils of Guarino, by Neville and his Greek scribes, and by scholars at Canterbury, Oxford and Cambridge. The story is an interesting one, recalling the figures of Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, John of Whethamstede, Grey, Gunthorpe, Sellyng and others, or again, the more or less intimate relations established with Poggio, Decembrio, Chrysoloras and Guarino. Of interest, too, are the facts that already there had been collected manuscripts of Seneca's *Tragedies* and Tacitus's *Dialogus*, besides works of Pindar, Theocritus, Sophocles and Euripides. Yet as the narrative proceeds it is realized that the achievements at this stage were limited solely to the collecting of MSS. and translations, the founding of libraries, attempts to learn Greek and to write in classical fashion (*stylo tulliano*). These matters are amply explained and illustrated by Dr Weiss: but he is less successful in indicating where English humanism at this stage fell short of humanism in its wider and more liberal sense. In Italy, as earlier in England by John of Salisbury, ancient literature had been viewed as human documents, records of ancient wisdom and human activities: and as a result a new cultural outlook had been attained. In the works of Vergerius, L. Valla, Bruni and Politian, for instance, attempts had been made to recapture the spirit of antiquity by means of criticism of a textual, historical and even an aesthetic kind: so that a wider vision of literature, new methods of approach and an increasing concern with literary values were the outcome. Of all this, however, few if any traces are

to be found in contemporary English humanism: and the actual value of its achievement would have emerged more clearly in the light of some such comparison.

That the work is the result of careful and scholarly research, however, there can be no doubt: though, on the other hand, it cannot be said to afford exciting reading, and one could have wished for clearer pictures of the intellectual conditions and personalities involved. Occasionally there are minor lapses of various kinds, as for instance, the references to Lilly's *Euphues* (p. 29) and to Boccaccio's *de Genealogiis Deorum* (pp. 36 (n.), 64): or again, the unhyphenated forms 'far fetched' (p. 44) and 'time serving' (p. 132). Questionable, too, is the wisdom of employing the term 'neo-classicism' for the new feeling for the classics (pp. 4, 30 *passim*), and of describing the works of Petrarch and Boccaccio as 'neo-classical' in kind (p. 60). The term, however apt and justified, is likely to prove confusing. It has the disadvantage of being generally associated nowadays with a later development of literary theory; and its use in this unfamiliar sense may well prove puzzling to not a few readers. For the rest, the work must be welcomed as making a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the period: and this it does primarily in demonstrating as its main thesis that humanism in fifteenth-century England was little more than a modification of Scholasticism, a movement utilitarian in character and concerned mainly with improving activities in the fields of theology and diplomacy. That thesis is developed with abundant well-documented biographical and bibliographical detail, accumulated as the result of much good hunting in quiet and remote libraries. In short, one of the outstanding features of the work is the first-hand acquaintance shown with rare texts and all sorts of unpublished manuscripts: and future workers in the field are likely to find here abundant references and material of a most useful kind.

J. W. H. ATKINS

ABERYSTWYTH

Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance. By VERÉ L. RUBEL. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press. 1941. xiii+312 pp. 18s. 6d.

Dr Rubel here presents most useful apparatus for the study of the poetry of the sixteenth century by the standards of the reading public of the age. He correlates poetry from Skelton to Spenser with critical comment and with Puttenham's definitions of rhetorical figures to show that the 'filing' of speech, the conceits, the stylized variations in diction and phrase are the structural timber of sixteenth-century poetry.

Of the Early Tudor period he says that 'at no previous time in the history of English literature did diction come so near to being a central concern among the generality of writers'. This he proves by abundant examples, which should encourage the steadily growing recognition of the importance of this period in which so many of the vital interests of the Elizabethan period are established. Two in particular are brought out by Dr Rubel's work, the interest in Chaucer's language at a time when the business of men of letters and poets was the fashioning of a vernacular fit for all kinds of literary expression, and the increasing use of formal rhetoric. The progress of these two topics is traced from Caxton, Skelton, Hawes and Barclay through Wyatt, Surrey, Grimald, Sackville, Gascoigne and Sidney to Spenser. Whatever the kind of poetry—lyric, experimental quantitative verse, pastoral or sonnet—and whatever the degree of the poet, this two-fold theme is inherent in all work.

Not all will agree with the placing of Skelton among 'the principal exponents of aureation' with whom 'poetry found itself in a verbal cul-de-sac'. Skelton's aggressive command of language of all kinds, from the vigorous fluency of the

'Skeltonics' to the lyric simplicity of his poems to children of his acquaintance, set him apart. It may be in part the same sense of decorum which makes him use aureate terms in his early allegorical poems as makes Chaucer use the figures of rhetoric which Dr Rubel identifies in *Troilus and Criseyde*. A notable omission in a work which gives prominence to Sir Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* is that of the writers of the medieval *artes poetriae* and the Early Tudor rhetoricians, Richard Sherry and Leonard Cox, who provide example and definition for the poet before the work of Wilson and the retrospective survey of Puttenham.

These are, however, minor faults compared with the abundance of useful material brought together for the first time and the valuable detailed studies of the important poets with which Dr Rubel makes an important contribution to Tudor scholarship.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

The Poems of George Chapman. Edited by PHYLLIS BROOKS BARTLETT. New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press. 1941. xii + 488 pp. 30s.

Since the publication, thirty years ago, of Professor Thomas Marc Parrott's editions of Chapman's comedies and tragedies, an edition of the poems has been expected from him; but though he and M. F. L. Schoell planned to produce one, their plan has never come to fruition, and this new edition by Miss Phyllis Bartlett now appears with their approval and encouragement. It is a satisfying and scholarly piece of work with which one can pick few quarrels. With the exception of the translations from Homer and Hesiod it contains all Chapman's non-dramatic poetry and the prose *Justification of Nero*, printed according to the early editions and in chronological order of the publication of the volumes—the complimentary and occasional pieces are collected together and arranged chronologically in order of the books in which they appeared—with textual and critical notes. There are not many additions to the contents of Shepherd's edition: only the verses from *England's Parnassus* ascribed to Chapman, two poems from a manuscript in the Bodleian (Ashmole 38) which are regrettably interesting as evidence of the quarrel between Chapman and Jonson, and a few short poems, of which three, it is plausibly suggested, were omitted by Shepherd because Chapman used them again in *The Revenge of Bussy*. Marlowe's share of *Hero and Leander* is included for completeness, and so is the doubtful poem of *The Amorous Zodiack* and *The Amorous Contention of Phillis and Flora* by 'R. S.', since they form part of the volume *Ovids Banquet of Sense*.

That is to say, this edition includes what may be called Chapman's original poetry, but, as the editor observes in the admirable essay which forms the introduction, and as she proves in the notes, 'the question of what constitutes Chapman's "original poetry" will probably remain something of a puzzle to any editor of Chapman'. This does not mean that Chapman is not an original poet, and his originality is shown not least in his handling of his extensive borrowings, which may be traced with considerably more ease than formerly by the use of the notes here. The ease, it must be added, is hampered by one factor for which someone, presumably the editor, is to blame: in the notes there are no page references back to the poems, and if the reader wishes to consult the notes, it is necessary to turn back to the index to discover on what page the notes to any volume begin, and then to work through to the poem under consideration.

One suggested interpretation (p. 458) of a gloss of Chapman's on *Eugenia*, l. 471, may be queried: 'false and worldly Professors' refers surely to that type of hypocritical Puritans—'professors' in the ordinary phrase of the time—whom Chapman's plays show him to have disliked intensely. The few textual emendations carry

conviction, with the exception of *grounde* for *rounde* in *Owds Banquet of Sence*, 11, 5, since *rounde* as well as *grounde* might describe the bank surrounding the fountain. With Chapman's adverbial use of *meere* in *Hero and Leander* (Sestiad III, l. 90) one might compare Queen Elizabeth's boast of being 'mere English'. The explanatory notes on pp. 5 and 421 on recent theories about 'The School of Night' show praiseworthy caution.

Chapman's translations still remain to be edited, and it may not be too much to hope that Miss Bartlett already has them in hand. The task would be light after the labours she has here achieved.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

The Mind of a Poet. A Study of Wordsworth's Thought with particular reference to 'The Prelude'. By RAYMOND DEXTER HAVENS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xviii + 670 pp. \$5 00.

The enormous bulk of Professor R. D. Havens's book, surprising to eyes which have grown accustomed to the compressed volumes of wartime printing, is an indication of its other qualities. It is the product of forty years of interest in Wordsworth and fifteen years of particular investigation and thought, and though it contains a small proportion of previously published matter, it is in the main a new book. After Preface and Introduction it falls into two parts, the first a study of Wordsworth's mind, based on a survey of *The Prelude* but not ignoring the other poems, the second a detailed commentary on *The Prelude* itself. Professor Havens uses the great De Selincourt edition as his basis, avoiding the repetition of matter to be found there and including the more important additions and corrections made later, but he has not taken the 1804-5 text as the norm, and that for good reasons:

By '*The Prelude*' is generally understood *The Prelude* of 1850. It has always been so; presumably it always will be so. This is the only version that is generally accessible and widely known; it is the only one the poet himself sanctioned for publication, and there is a fair probability that even in 1805 he would have found it more satisfactory than the version he completed in that year but had no intention of publishing without revision. Finally, in retaining the 1850 text as the standard we are following the principle advocated by the poet himself—

that of 'following strictly the last Copy of the text of an Author'. Moreover, as Professor Havens points out, the 1850 text often is more accurate even in its account of facts and in its picture of the poet's early mind, and 'years of detailed comparison of the different versions have convinced me that, as poetry, the final text is, on the whole, much the best... But wherever significant differences exist in the 1804-5 version this is also quoted and A is inserted between the number of the book and of the lines.'

Professor Havens has, in fact, made the best of two possible courses, and the candid and independent judgement displayed here is shown repeatedly throughout the volume: in, for instance, the discussion of Wordsworth's 'animism', especially pp. 78-84, in the chapter on Nature and its ministrations, especially, again, in the insistence on the fact, often overlooked, that 'many of his most impressive experiences took place in bad weather, when the loveliness of the countryside was lost but its loneliness, fearsomeness, and mystery were increased'—that 'in the "spots of time" the scenes that were stamped upon his memory and affections were not attractive, and there is no reason to suppose that beauty played any part in making memorable the occasions when he robbed the trap of another boy, or hunted birds' eggs, or lost his way crossing the Alps, or tried to sleep in the woods beyond Gravedona, or fled the mountain that "like a living thing strode after"

him'; and, again in the same chapter, the demonstration that 'the unattractive side of country life did not escape his keen observation and strong matter-of-factness', and the wise passage on the essential distinction between 'what nature is and what she may mean to man'. There is the same sense and wisdom in the chapter on Wordsworth's Anti-Rationalism. The chapter on *The Mystic Experience* is less certain, but it is hard to deal in words with incommunicable things, still more to analyse or explain the broken phrases which make the attempt. In *Religion* the core of the chapter is the remark that 'the real belief of most persons, the vital part by which they live, probably varies not only from year to year, but from day to day'. Or, it may be said, even more rapidly: G. K. Chesterton, in one of his essays, gives the sequence of his reflexions, with their philosophical and religious implications, on being knocked down in the road, and most of us, if we have been near sudden death, can recognize the truth of his analysis. The chapter on *Imagination* has a clear account of the evidence of Wordsworth's meaning, as distinct from what is often put forward as his meaning.

The same clear, honest patience in elucidation is to be found in the Commentary, with here and there a touch of wit, as in the choice of the prefatory quotations—notably Eric Gill's 'If I remember such and such rather than something else, it must be because I'm a different person from what I would have been if I had remembered other things.' Where there is so much gratitude for new suggestions, and so much general agreement, there is also pleasure in singling out a few passages for the expression of disagreement. Thus, on i, 109: 'The repetition of "things" is unpleasant.' Perhaps it is, but one has to remember that 'things' was a word with almost mystical connotations to Wordsworth, and the repetition may mean something. Again, I do not believe that the Negro Ladies of vii, 228 were 'dark-skinned ladies from India'. Negresses, says Professor Havens, could not have afforded muslin. But West Indian heiresses with a strong admixture of African blood, like Thackeray's Miss Swartz, could have afforded as much muslin as they cared to have, and were by no means unfamiliar sights in London at that date; whereas dark-skinned ladies from India, who would, incidentally, neither then nor now wear white muslin, seldom came to England even if married to Englishmen. No: the Negro Ladies were of the same blood as the female—or fellow—passenger from Calais a dozen years later. On the vexed question of Wordsworth's appreciation of works of art (ix, 31) Hazlitt and Haydon are supported by Opie, who said that Wordsworth was the only man he knew, not an artist, who looked at pictures like an artist. We do not think highly now of Le Brun's *Magdalene*, but in the first place we all have our youthful indiscretions in admiration, and in the second place pictures admired by good judges now may be scorned by good judges in a hundred and fifty years' time. 'Who now reads Cowley?' is a question with uncomfortable implications.

But orderly to end where I begun: this is as indispensable as any book of its kind can be in these days of the destruction of books; and if wartime economies make its second edition a little slimmer, that may be a kindness to those students of Wordsworth who have fewer shelves on which to put their books.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

The Poetry of Matthew Arnold. A Commentary. By C. B. TINKER and H. F. LOWRY.
London: Oxford University Press. 1940. xvi + 404 pp. 12s. 6d.

This commentary is the companion volume to the editors' new edition of Arnold's poems, and since that is to include Arnold's own notes, prefaces and appendices, they are not printed here. The volume benefits, however, from the use of the Yale Manuscript and other unpublished papers, as well as books left in Arnold's library,

and these materials have often, the editors tell us, 'afforded the key, not merely to the origin of a poem, but also to its meaning and significance'.

The Introduction discusses the various editions, up to the standard edition of 1890, the valuable Yale Manuscript—'a collection of first drafts of poems and of brief reflections or meditations which might possibly prove of use to the poet in his future work of composition'—and Arnold's lists of poems to compose. Then follows the Commentary, which covers the published poems in the order in which Arnold left them and goes on to include *Cancelled Poems*, *Unpublished Poems*, an *Appendix* which consists of a map of the Scholar-Gipsy country and an essay on that country by Sir Francis Wylie, a *Bibliographical Note* and an index. The *Early Poems*, *Sonnets*, *Later Poems* and *Unpublished Poems* are preceded by prefatory notes, and these, with the critical and textual commentary on the individual poems, show the ripe scholarship, judgement and understanding of Arnold which we have learnt to expect from the editors.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Tennyson in Egypt: a Study of the Imagery of his Earlier Work. By W. D. PADEN. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications. 1942. 178 pp. \$1.50.

Such tricks hath strong imagination

It is a delicate procedure to seek to understand something of the inward working of these 'tricks', but those who succumb to the allurements will be interested in the suggestions made in this study of Tennyson; which, on the whole, suggests more than it states, despite its many detailed annotations. The main thesis may not be quite acceptable to Tennyson lovers, for with all his caution Professor Paden has not ambiguously pointed to a line of approach to his subject which borders on psychiatry. The conditions in which Tennyson spent his boyhood, its loneliness and dominance by his father, a man of exceptional character, are used to explain supposed repressions of the adolescent boy; Professor Paden infers their presence in many of the early poems, and his argument has validity when he traces their gradual modification in Tennyson's later work.

This author is not the first to have seen that the boy who wrote the early poems was, to use Stephen Gwynn's words, 'in love with the desire to be in love'; but he has taken as his special study the influences that led to this boyish attitude. The tendencies that guided Tennyson's early reading, within the limits of the Rev. George Clayton Tennyson's ample library, show a taste for the exotic and sensuous. The sensibility of C.-E. Savary, and the exuberance of Sir William Jones, reinforced if they did not awaken these tendencies. The East was suffused with their light and Tennyson bathed himself therein. The delicate voluptuousness of the early poems was followed by the passion and beauty of *Maud*.

An examination of *Poems by Two Brothers* leads to a further conclusion in which our author is at pains to refute the traditional views held about Tennyson's classical precocity by such authorities as Professor Lounsbury. In this matter, he says, 'naïvety has entrapped sophistication'.

Continuing his study of the poet's early sources, he refers many of Tennyson's characteristic images to his reading of *The Hundred Wonders of the World*, a juvenile compilation purporting to be by the Rev. C. C. Clarke; and possibly also to its successor, *A Geographical View of the World*: Mr Paden's researches show that the supposed author of this second volume, encouragingly styled the Rev. J. Goldsmith, was but another amusing fancy of the editor, Sir Richard Phillips. He does not ask if these and other books always served the poet's genius well. Tennyson to-day suffers from having tried to incorporate too many of the transitory conclusions of science in his poetry, although once rated so high for this attempt. The fading of

the evolutionary and other theories has affected a part of his work; so possibly too will the attempts of some of our contemporaries to assimilate the practices and inventions of the day to an ideal expression in poetry eventually impair their value. As in his treatment of love, Tennyson's attitude to philosophic problems is not always the gainer by an over-fidelity to the physical and concrete, notwithstanding the exquisite beauty of the details and the almost invariable nobility of the conclusions.

There are some improprieties of language in *Tennyson in Egypt*, such as the reference to Coleridge's 'phenomenal memory' (p. 6), and the 'lamentable quatrains' (for 'full of lamenting') of Tennyson's poem *The Outcast* (p. 62). It would seem, too, that more precision in the use of terms is needed at times, as when the simple verb 'apprehend' is employed generally with objects of such different categories as a feeling (an emotion in the next phrase was not very obviously in need of separate enumeration), an action, a scene, and a melody.

IRIS E. SELLS

DURHAM

The Rise of English Literary History. By RENÉ WELLEK. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. vii + 275 pp. 18s. 6d.

Dr Wellek ambitiously defines literary history as a history of ideas rather than of scholarship or criticism alone, 'of the programmes and theoretical reflexions' of those engaged in literary study, and, in this book, of 'the underlying methods, ideals and conceptions that governed the actual writing of the history of English literature'. The present work covers the period from the Middle Ages to the end of the eighteenth century, and a second volume is promised continuing the study to the nineteenth century.

The scope of the work does not conform with the vast programme Dr Wellek has set himself. The early chapters, in which he is seeking 'the seeds of ideas and forms which had a later flowering', do less than justice to the intellectual liveliness of the Middle Ages and the early sixteenth century. Literary history strictly according to his definition may be recognized as a separate genre only when the narrative form is developed for it, but there is ample preparation for it in this early period. A continuous tradition exists in the medieval poet's avowed indebtedness to his sources, in the recurring mention of authors and examples from such classical literature as was preserved in encyclopedias and works of rhetoric and poetic.

Dr Wellek sketches the growth in the eighteenth century of historical research, bibliography and interest in Anglo-Saxon literature and language shown by antiquarians, among whom Sir Thomas Browne should have been mentioned. Among the varied interests of the century, the recognition of language as 'part and parcel of the human mind, of its development and growth', is well demonstrated.

While some similar points of interest emerge, the general impression is one of inadequacy, of the impossibility of dealing with questions of criticism, aesthetics and philosophy in the name of literary history. A just treatment of these topics seems to require either a work of greater compass than Dr Wellek has attempted or a succession of more fully detailed studies to prove his thesis.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

English Institute Annual, 1941. New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. xiv + 248 pp. 16s. 6d.

This, as the Editor, Mr Rudolf Kirk, explains in his preface, is the third of the *English Institute Annuals*. It includes only about half of the papers read at the

Institute, which was held at Columbia University in September 1941. Many of the discussions were informal and some of the papers are being published in other periodicals. The Institute, which is held to discuss 'basic problems in the philosophy and technique of research, as distinct from discussions of specified subject-matter', was divided this year into four sections:

- I. Problems in the editing of texts.
- II. Literature and the arts.
- III. Printing house practice in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
- IV. Literary criticism: the interpretation of poetry.

Altogether we have nine essays, one each from sections II and IV, four from section I and three from section III. This year's volume is therefore mainly concerned with editorial and bibliographical problems.

First of all, however, we are given Mr Lionel Trilling's new analysis of Wordsworth's *Ode: Intimations of Immortality*, the subject which formed the focus of the literary criticism section. Trilling denies the validity of the theory that the *Ode* is 'Wordsworth's conscious farewell to his art, a dirge sung over his departing powers', and looks for the key to the poet's intention in *Resolution and Independence*; while, therefore, the *Ode* does reflect a crisis in the poet's mental life, the crisis is not one of failure, but of achievement. Moreover, the crisis is not individual but universal, at least so far as the poetic or artistic life is concerned, Wordsworth merely cites himself as one who, after passing through all the stages of recession from the 'visionary gleam', which he believes us to inherit at birth, has reached that maturity when, the gleam being wholly lost, he begins to doubt his possession of the creative power. It was the leech-gatherer's 'timely utterance' that brought him courage and strength again.

The section which was devoted to literature and the arts is represented here by Mr René Wellek's lecture *The Parallelism of the Arts*, in which the author enumerates several attempts, from the time of Schlegel onwards, to discover structural affinities between the literature and the arts of a particular period. Most of these theories he explodes with ease and precision; indeed, it is a little difficult to understand why thirty-five pages of the volume should have been taken up with explosions which any amateur marksman could have effected. The author concludes forthrightly that present methods of study of the structural community of the arts are fruitless and that the problem should be approached anew. Hesitatingly he proposes to find a basis for comparison in the reduction of all the arts to branches of semiology. 'In such terms as signs, norms, and values I would look for a description of the common basis of the arts.'

How close has become the relationship between textual criticism and what I have called elsewhere textual bibliography is demonstrated by the seven remaining essays. While four of these were delivered before the section concerned with editorial problems and three before the bibliographical section, all of them discuss problems which are either bibliographical or closely related to bibliography. J. Burke Severs's description and criticism of Dom Quentin's theory of textual criticism forms a useful introduction to the series. Mr Severs maintains the fundamental soundness of Quentin's system so far as the examination of manuscripts by threes and the determination of intermediaries are concerned, though I doubt if all editors would agree wholeheartedly with the rule that 'two extreme manuscripts will never agree against the intermediary'. He rightly points out the falsity of some of Quentin's corollaries and urges the need for a searching constructive criticism of his principles.

Dr Madeleine Doran's contribution deals with the evaluation of evidence in Shakespearean textual criticism and shows by example how strictly bibliographical data, i.e. data which are accidental to the transmission of the text, can establish the highest degree of probability, whereas spelling, punctuation, variant readings of equal literary value, stage directions, speech headings, etc., may establish

probabilities, but only in so far as the sources of these abnormalities can be determined.

Arthur Friedman, in his essay on historical annotation in critical editions of modern texts, distinguishes between 'notes of recovery' and 'explanatory notes'. The former are notes explanatory of allusions in the text and should be based on references to contemporary and not to later works, since as far as possible we should use material which could have been accessible to the author. Such a statement strikes one as so obvious that it should be unnecessary for any serious editor to be reminded of it, yet Mr Friedman quotes examples of the misuse of later reference material by otherwise reputable editors. 'Explanatory notes' are those which endeavour to trace the sources from which the author derived his text.

The next of these contributions, Mr Sculley Bradley's plea for a variorum edition of Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and the establishment of a new definitive text, is probably less general in appeal than the rest of the volume, nevertheless, it serves as an example of method in the comparison of editions.

Finally, we have three essays on bibliographical method. The first, by R. C. Bald, deals with evidence and inference in bibliography, and argues, quite rightly, that the rules of textual or critical bibliography cannot have the same validity as those of the exact sciences, because whilst the latter are based on experiments which can be made under more or less determined circumstances, bibliography is essentially an historical study and cannot reproduce all the circumstances under which a particular work was printed. He also points out, with examples, some of the dangers arising from the reliance which bibliography has to place on analogy. His whole paper is a timely warning against making too general assumptions on untested hypotheses.

Fredson Bowers returns in this volume to the subject of headlines, which he has already discussed at some length in the *Library*.¹ He begins with some definitions, viz. 'skeleton', which is 'all the material which surrounds the type pages' or that part of the forme (except the headlines) which is not type; 'running-title', which is to be applied only to the letterpress of the headline; and 'headline', which is 'the letterpress of the running-title on any single page plus the quads on either side of it which, extending out to the margins... may include the type used for foliation or pagination'. These three seem to me sensible enough, but in defining 'forme' Mr Bowers adopts the common practice of using the term to denote both one side of a printed sheet of paper and the type pages which would print it, with, of course, the skeleton. Surely it is quite time that some distinction was made between the type and the letterpress, if only because the latter is the reverse of the former. It would seem to me safer to use the term 'forme' only for the type in its chase, and to describe one side of a printed sheet as the 'outer (or inner) letterpress'.

Mr Bowers then shows how a careful examination of headlines can throw light on a number of bibliographical problems. He is now fully satisfied that it was normal practice up to the seventeenth century for the headlines to remain part of the skeleton and therefore to be transferred from one forme to another without disturbance except for the alteration of page or folio numbers. It follows that peculiarities discovered in the type or measurement of headlines can indicate the order in which the formes went through the press and so establish the precedence of one state over another. Furthermore, headlines can be used as evidence for the order in which the sheets of a quired gathering were printed and are almost always a means of detecting cancels, since the headline of a cancel is very rarely in the same state as those used in subsequent formes.

Charlton Hinman continues the subject of headlines in the last essay in the volume and makes the point that in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries we may generally find printers using two skeletons for each sheet, one in the inner and

¹ 4th series, XIX (1938-9), 315-38.

one in the outer forme, because the use of two skeletons saves time and time was precious between 1586 and 1634, when the number of presses was strictly limited. On the other hand, the use of two skeletons to a sheet is only economical if the rate of composition is as rapid as the rate of printing. If a single skeleton is used therefore it is likely to be evidence of a small edition, and Mr Hinman argues with considerable ingenuity and some support from external evidence concerning the size of the edition of *Othello*, 1622. After throwing fresh light on Dr Greg's theory of the stop-press correction of the Pide Bull *Lear*, he draws three significant conclusions: (1) If only one skeleton was being used for both formes, the substitution of one forme for the other while the press was working was practically impossible; in such cases then we may find variants on either side of the sheet; (2) in books showing more than two sets of headlinés, the *Lear* method could be used for correction and we should find variants on only one side of each sheet; the invariant letterpress would represent the corrected state; and (3) in books showing two sets of headlines, variants may usually, but by no means always, be found on only one side of each sheet, again the invariant side would be the corrected state.

I have analysed these essays at some length in order to demonstrate the way in which they fulfil the purpose of the English Institute. It will be agreed, I think, by anyone who reads the volume that it is a welcome contribution to the method of scholarship in English and bibliographical studies. Some of it is commonplace, no doubt, but is none the less useful as a reminder that we must rest our theories on solid foundations.

The volume is well produced (though we regret the addition of an imitation headband) and attractively printed; the index seems to be adequate.

JOHN D. COWLEY

NORTHWOOD

Girbert de Mes, according to MS. B (Berne 113). By MAURICE SILVER. New York: Columbia University Press 1942. 212 pp.

In a review of Dr Herman J. Green's *Ansejys de Mes* (*M L.R.* Oct. 1940), it was recalled that Paulin Paris considered the Geste des Loherains 'une des plus intéressantes que puisse offrir la littérature primitive d'aucun peuple... d'un secours inappréciable pour la topographie... de la Lorraine, de l'Artois et de la Picardie'. Léon Gautier similarly speaks of 'le cycle sanglant et sauvage des Lorrains, qu'on pourrait appeler le cycle féodal par excellence, cycle de la haine et de la guerre privée à l'est de la France dans l'ancienne Austrasie'.¹ The story of the great feud between the Loherains and the Bordelais-Flamands and of their combined resistance to the Saracen invader, no less in the *Girbert de Mes*, the third part, than in the fourth and last branch of the cycle, the *Ansejys*, is certainly characterized by unusual realism, and contains many references to places in the north and east of France which have their own poignant and recent interest for French and British readers.

The edition under review of the *Girbert de Mes* presents in a convenient form a seventh part (lines 8879-10,822, laisses CXXXIII-CCLXXXII) of the text, according to the MS. of Berne (B), with, as footnotes, the variants of nine of the other MSS. mentioned in *Romania*, III, 196-7, of which seven are (or were) in the Bibliothèque Nationale (viz. CDEFMPV), one (J) in the Bibliothèque de l'École de Médecine de Montpellier, and one (O) in the Bodleian Library. The work was begun under the direction of Dr Pauline Taylor, who has done much for research on the Loherain cycle, both by her own published work (her critical edition of *Garin le Loherain* is noted in the issue of May 1942 of *Work in Progress in the Modern Humanities*) and also by means of the special Seminar of Columbia University devoted to the study

¹ *Épopées françaises*, I, 126.

of this cycle. The *Girbert* has never been published in full, though extracts from its 15,000 lines have appeared from time to time, notably the first 2460 lines given by Stengel in *Romanische Studien*, I (1875), 441-552.

The part of the branch here edited contains a lively account of the help which Girbert gives against the Saracens to Anseÿs of Cologne, whose daughter has been betrothed to him, and of the simultaneous struggle of Girbert to obtain from King Pepin the fief of Bordeaux still held by Fromondin, though he is a prisoner in Saint Seurin. There are scenes of vivid narrative and dialogue, in which the women take their part with considerable independence and power of expression, while the *regrets funèbres* might almost be compared with those of the *Roland*. The *Girbert* certainly appears to be worth more attention than it has received.

The 'Introduction' (which comes at the end) is a study of the various case-forms of nouns and adjectives found in the first thousand lines of the text, showing the flectional disturbances and the strong influence of the oblique case, with frequent reference to other texts. Schwan-Behrens' paradigms are taken as the normal forms, deviations from these, apart from errors, being viewed as possible developments of new forms. The statistics of conformity are carefully tabulated and the conclusion reached with some hesitation that B is earlier than the MS. N version of the *Garin* and the *Anseÿs*, and that it may be of the late twelfth century. The language is that of the Ile de France, with numerous Picard characteristics; in this connexion I think the two examples of *foie* quoted as 'unusual' (pp. 182, 200), are the Picard equivalent for *foiee* and not a mere 'spelling' for *fois* in the interest of the metre and the assonance. A few more notes would have been useful in the case of certain difficulties, e.g. in line 9029, 'En fuies torne li moines et l'abé', the variant 'prieux' for 'moines' is probably right, since the monk is fainting and hardly in a condition to fly; in line 9652, 'C'estoit li sires li portoit le dragon', the second 'li' should probably be 'ki' ('qui' in the variants); in line 10,575, 'plaine bos' can hardly be right; E and F give 'plain boucel'. In a few cases the lines do not scan, e.g. line 9178, 'Ne me dagna escouter ne fi veoir'; these might have been pointed out. It seems that lines 9544-9550 would be clearer in inverted commas. Numerals would also in my opinion read better as words, though there are obvious difficulties in transcribing them in the appropriate case, where declension is uncertain. The use of the accent (to mark a stressed *e*) is not always consistent, e.g. in line 9402, 'Amont el tertre esté vos Fromondin'. There is no index or glossary, but a useful bibliography closes the short introduction, and this as well as the part of the text here available should be of considerable service to students of the *geste*. It is to be hoped that a sequel to the present volume will shortly appear from the files of Columbia University Library (where the text exists in typewritten form), relating the way in which Girbert is made to 'cierement comparer' the death of old Fromont, a vengeance which is foreshadowed in his son's *regret* over his father, directed against his former ally but bitter foe:

Ahi! Gerbers, comment vos puis amer!
Vos li tolistes trestote s'erité;
Par vostre gerre il a renoié Dé.

F. C. JOHNSON

EDINBURGH

Yvain (le Chevalier au Lion). By CHESTIEN DE TROYES. The critical text of WENDELIN FÖRSTER with introduction, notes and glossary by T. B. W. REID. Manchester: University Press. 1942. xxiii+263 pp. 7s. 6d.

This will prove an extremely useful publication: it gives us a handy text of one of the most delightful works in Old French literature, a work that had become almost unobtainable since the war and which, even before the war, sometimes proved

inconvenient for university classes because of the difficulties of German notes and glossary.

The text is a photographic reproduction of Förster's latest edition (1912); naturally, it has all the disadvantages of composite texts and regularized spelling, but as the MSS. of *Yvain* are all in France and Italy, there could be no question of producing a new text, and the editor has followed the only possible course.

The Introduction, of the kind made familiar by the *Classiques français du moyen-âge*, gives in concise form most of the essential information that we possess about Chrétien, together with an explanation of Förster's method of establishing his text and an analysis of the language of the poem. The various conflicting views about the sources used by Chrétien are noted objectively, and the student is provided with plenty of bibliographical help for more detailed study. The Notes are fuller than is usual in this type of edition, and they will be found extremely useful, both by university students (for whom they are chiefly intended) and by others, for they contain, besides grammatical comments, information about the proper names, and discussions of Förster's readings. The glossary contains all the words except those that are easily recognizable by their resemblance to Modern French, but there is no Index of proper names; though all the relevant information is to be found in the Notes, an alphabetical list would have been useful as well.

The editor claims to have avoided 'aesthetic judgements' in his introduction and notes; this seems a pity, for medieval studies in our universities are bound to be lop-sided until aesthetic judgements claim their full share of attention. An editor is of course entitled to approach his task from whatever angle he chooses, and in any case sound philology is a necessary basis for detailed literary criticism of a medieval work, but one cannot help feeling that this excellent edition would have been improved if the literary qualities of the romance had received rather fuller treatment.

B. WOLEDGE

LONDON

Boileau en France au Dix-huitième siècle. By J. R. MILLER. (*The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages.* Extra Volume, xviii.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1942. 626 pp. 33s. 6d.

This imposing volume with its very complete critical apparatus is a scholarly production planned and written with great care and precision—an excellent piece of research. To rescue from the oblivion of the past contemporary opinions upon such an important literary figure as Boileau and to evaluate those opinions clearly and concisely is a labour demanding tremendous patience and finished scholarship. These qualities Professor Miller displays in full measure in the book under review.

The work is concerned with Boileau's literary reputation in France during the eighteenth century. Professor Miller disclaims any intention of treating Boileau's direct influence, but is it possible to study the one without the other? To attempt to distinguish between a man's literary reputation and his direct influence would seem to create a somewhat arbitrary division. In point of fact, a whole chapter, 3^e Partie, Chap. vi, has been devoted to the consideration of Boileau's influence, and indeed the study could not be complete without it.

Some readers may think that Professor Miller is over-liberal with his quotations and footnotes, but in an investigation of this nature it is extremely difficult to decide what to quote and what to summarize. If too much quotation be wearisome, too much summarizing may be misleading.

Starting with Boileau's death in 1711 and ending in 1810, Professor Miller carefully investigates all contemporary works and periodicals. The book is divided into

four parts: 'Boileau et le Cartésianisme littéraire', 'Boileau et les "Philosophes"', 'Boileau et la Question du Génie', 'Boileau et la Fin du Classicisme'. There is an introduction and conclusion to each part and a general conclusion at the end of the enquiry. The whole book is a sound piece of workmanship and the thirty-nine misprints are no more than one must expect in a study of this size.

With the author's clear and admirably succinct findings no one will quarrel: 'Boileau, tel qu'on se l'est représenté pendant un siècle, est un exemple fort clair des déformations que nous faisons subir aux grands écrivains, selon nos goûts ou nos nécessités de polémique.'

Indeed, the lesson seems to be that the literary reputation of the greatest men of letters is at the mercy of fashionable modes of thought. The obscurest and most eccentric of authors will seize upon a great man's views and quote them in support of his own. This inevitably happened to 'le législateur du Parnasse'. On the other hand, Boileau, the sturdy conservative of seventeenth-century classicism, was bound to be the target of the partisans of change in the eighteenth century, but the most irreverent often came to criticize and stayed to admire.

H E WHITTLE

LEICESTER

Un voyageur-philosophe au XVIIIe siècle, l'abbé Jean-Bernard Le Blanc. By HÉLÈNE MONOD-CASSIDY. (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, Volume XVII.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. 554 pp. 28s.

On opening this book, one reads with surprised irritation the first sentence of the publisher's note inside the jacket: 'The celebrated Abbé le Blanc was one of the most interesting Frenchmen of the first half of the eighteenth century.' The reader should not, however, be discouraged from proceeding further, for the author herself makes much more modest claims for the now almost forgotten Abbé in the hundred pages or so in which she summarizes his life and writings, and describes the circles in which he moved. Restored to his true place as a minor literary figure, the Abbé begins to take on a certain interest as the author of a successful tragedy, as the translator of Hume, and, above all, on account of his visit to England in the years 1737 and 1738, which led to the publication, in 1745, of the *Lettres d'un Français concernant le gouvernement, la politique et les mœurs des Anglais et des Français*. This work, which enjoyed considerable favour in its day, is now chiefly remembered for its observations on the English theatre, and especially on Shakespeare.

Although in these opening chapters the career and achievements of Abbé Le Blanc are made as lively and interesting as the case permits, the author rightly attaches greater importance to the 300 pages of his letters which follow. Apart from a number written to Hume and various other correspondents, the great bulk of the letters, published for the first time in their entirety, were addressed between 1728 and 1745 to the Abbé's patron, Président Bouhier. Some of these letters cover, of course, the period of Le Blanc's residence in England, and offer a foretaste of the *Lettres d'un Français*; but the chief interest lies in that part of the correspondence in which he kept his patron informed of the literary and intellectual gossip of Paris. Since the Abbé knew everyone of note in those circles, the Bouhier MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale have frequently been used to illumine the private lives, as well as the publication and reception of the writings, of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Buffon, Prévost, Marivaux, La Chaussée, etc. To have these letters carefully edited, annotated and indexed would be at any time a great convenience; under present conditions our debt to the editor is even greater.

Inevitably a certain number of gaps or mistakes are to be found in the text of the correspondence or in the notes. To give one or two examples, taken at random,

the note on editions of the *Lettres philosophiques* (p. 480) contains no mention of the existence of what was probably the first French edition, that published in London with the inscription *A Basle*. A colleague of Montesquieu at the Parlement de Bordeaux is described (p. 199) as 'président au *Parti de Bourdeaux*'; the mystery of the 'arrêt des quatre S. pour titre' (p. 161) which the notes are unable to elucidate, can be explained if one reads *livre* for *titre*, and recalls that in 1732 the Parlement de Paris was ordered at a *lit de justice* to register a decree prolonging this addition to indirect taxation, which had been in force since 1715.

Again, apart from a certain number of minor misprints which can easily be rectified by the reader, there occur from time to time passages which, though printed without comment, can scarcely be said to make sense. One is therefore left wondering whether Le Blanc actually wrote (p. 281): 'Les Dames Angloises ont enfin réfléchi de quelle *abilité* il leur pouvoit être' (for *utilité*?); or (p. 390) 'M. de Voltaire a fait le madrigal suivant pour son Altesse, et il *bon vous dire* que c'est un *impromptu*' (?). However, such rare blemishes notwithstanding, the author offers us a carefully documented and lively account of the life and writings of Le Blanc, and an extremely useful edition of a correspondence which is of great importance for all those who are interested in the literary and intellectual life of Paris in the first half of the reign of Louis XV.

J. LOUGH

ABERDEEN

The Nuremberg Schembart Carnival. By SAMUEL L. SUMBERG. (Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, No. 12.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press 1941. viii+234 pp. 20s.

This is the first systematic and comprehensive investigation of the chronicles of the Nuremberg Carnival, a festival that has been vaguely mentioned from time to time as a possible source of sixteenth-century Shrovetide plays. Basing his researches directly upon a MS. in the Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek, Mr Sumberg now gives detailed information on the exact nature of the *Schembartlauf*. Using the coloured illustrations and the texts of the original quarto volume, he describes the masked dancers in the festival, the grotesque figures that accompanied them and the pageant-cars that were an integral part of the civic festival of the butchers' guild. In addition, he gives an account of the various activities of the main performers and publishes from the MS. both the rhymed chronicle on the origins of the festival and the prose report of the so-called '*Krieg*' of 1507, when a rival group of players encroached upon the privileges of the butchers and staged a pageant of their own. The author is familiar with all the earlier publications of MSS. texts and illustrations, especially with Karl Drescher's coloured reproductions of the year 1908 from a Hamburg MS.; he has also read in manuscript the valuable unpublished researches of Prof. Brüggemann. The value of this new volume is greatly enhanced by the inclusion of some beautifully reproduced illustrations from the Nuremberg MS. In addition to the title-page and handsome Renaissance covers, the reader is able to see examples of black letter and italic typé used in the MS., not to mention a varied selection of fascinating miniatures.

The author shows that the MSS. (he lists some 70 in Appendix B) belong, both in form and content, to the tradition of the illustrated chronicle and are therefore typical works of the late Middle Ages. He deals with their relation to similar books of the period and with the problems of authorship and dating. Though it is possible to agree with him that the chronicles appeared after the last carnival in 1539 (palaeographic examinations already made of the MSS. support this view), his thesis that all the extant MSS. were copies of an *Urbild* is mere conjecture, based as it is on the non-existence of chronicles during the period of the Carnival, i.e. from 1449

to 1539. Mr Sumberg compares the account of the origins of the festival, as given in the rhymed verses of the MS., with that contained on the one hand in the outstanding fifteenth-century chronicles of a legendary character (the official *Historia* of Nuremberg of 1488 and Schedel's chronicle of 1493), and on the other hand in the more authentic historical records. This critical investigation leads to a rejection of the theory of the 'historical' beginnings of the celebrations and to a consideration of the butchers' dance as the survival of a primitive festival. Indications of the primitive origins are the hobby horses (see Fig. 3) and the pageants in the procession, the Pig-demon and Wild Man amongst the grotesque figures and the decorative motifs, such as flowers, foliage, flames and celestial bodies on the costumes of the *Läufer*. In the storming of the *Hölle* (see Fig. 56), the climax of the festival, the author sees the survival of ancient lustration rites. This idea of the primitive origins of the carnival is elaborated in a later chapter on the grotesque figures. Unfortunately, here Mr Sumberg begins to lose sight of the wood in looking at the trees. In his treatment of the Wild Man, for example, he gives detailed information about the giant, both as a legendary figure and as a literary character, and the repetition of this technique for each of the figures in turn becomes tedious to the reader who is still awaiting what has been promised him, an illumination of the connexions between the folk festival and the early theatre. Indeed, the major disappointment of the book is that only a few indications are given here and there of the transition from folk festival to carnival play.

The arrangement of the material is occasionally confusing. The chapter on the 'Origins of the *Schembart*' begins with a description of the Nuremberg MSS., although the descriptive account of the other MSS. is put in the previous chapter. The '*Krieg*' is published on pp. 47-50, but the author's account of it occurs on p. 93. Chapter I is rather unhappily entitled 'Problem of the *Schembart* Carnival', since it is primarily an account of earlier researches and an explanation of the scope of the author's own work. English readers will certainly quarrel with the style, especially with peculiar expressions like 'a characteristic itemization of all aspects of life', 'folkloristic point of view', and 'pageantic history'. But these criticisms of details cannot detract from the value of a critical and scholarly volume.

M. BEARE

CAMBRIDGE

Baroque Tradition in the Literature of the German Enlightenment, 1700-1750. Studies in the Determination of a Literary Period. By H. K. KETTLER. Cambridge: W. Heffer. 1943. vii+155 pp. 8s. 6d.

A work of this kind, which presents a welcome revaluation of literary terms and criticism, is of great importance to-day. As the author says: 'German literary criticism . . . is a mirror of the entire ideas and forces at work in the German people, thus transcending mere literary interest.' Dr Kettler approaches German baroque literature as an empiricist rejecting the *geistesgeschichtliche Methode* and its use of an emotive or evocative language. In the Introduction he refers to Wölfflin's famous 'five categories' [linear—picturesque (or painterly); plane—depth; integral form—free form; multiplicity—unity; absolute clarity—relative clarity] revealing the pitfalls into which Strich and others have stumbled in applying them to literary criticism. It is gratifying to see that the author refrains from drawing rash conclusions and is able to prove how various experts in their theory on 'baroque' (e.g. Ermatinger, Hausenstein, Cysarz, Scholte, Strich, G. Müller, etc.) can have 'diametrically opposite' views (p. 15). Dr Kettler might perhaps, however, have laid more stress on the *anti-courtly* elements (Moscherosch, Rist, Logau, Grimmelshausen, folk-song, religious song, etc.).

The first chapter, entitled 'Literature Justified', inquires into the poetic doctrines

prevalent at the time of the Baroque and early Enlightenment: i.e. religious and moral elements, literature as an intellectual exercise of the Professor Poeseos, didacticism, poet and inspiration, connexion between writer and moralist, lack of relation between life and poetry, literature as a side-line, etc. Although the Baroque and early Enlightenment paid 'lip-service' (p. 35) to the Horatian dictum that 'the poet is born, not made', Baroque is, according to the author, a phase of Rationalism (p. 25). To our mind the irrational element in the Baroque, although recognized by the author, suffers somewhat through his insistence on 'logic' and 'ratio'. On the other hand, due credit is given to the German Baroque writers' predilection for the 'actual' (p. 50 ff.). In this respect Opitz's *Vielquet* and *Lob des Krieges Gottes* or Gryphius's *Carolus Stuardus* might be added to his list.

The second chapter is devoted to the Baroque content in literary theory, i.e. imitation of the ancients, imitation of nature, probability, verisimilitude, the appeal for novelty and surprise, wit, imagination as a stimulus to invention, effect, the wondrous, etc. The author proves that here too there is a remarkable similarity between the Baroque and early Enlightenment. He is most cautious in his critical approach, knowing that literary theory and practice seldom go hand in hand, e.g. the problem of historical representation or Bretinger's conception of the wondrous which is 'nothing but a disguised probability' (p. 59). The passage about the hospital (p. 51) reminds one of modern pathological descriptions.

The third chapter analyses to what extent Baroque form exists in the Baroque poetics and the poetics of the early Enlightenment. Both movements agree as regards style ('a pattern of external ornament') and both protest against bombast: 'Baroque poetics consistently preached moderation in stylistic ornament' (p. 72). The author successfully deals with important problems in question: amplification, effect, intensification (p. 68), the 'natural' style, the sublime style, metaphor, description and invention, antithesis, oxymoron, compounds, etc. He rightly states: 'almost completely neglected' is the fact 'that among the various styles recommended by Gottsched's *Dichtkunst* was one corresponding in detail to the style of Lohenstein's plays' (p. 75)! The Baroque distinction between prose and poetry is confined to 'form', in this connexion a reference to A. Holz's theory (cf. his 'Hinter blühenden Apfelbaumzweigen...') might have been most illuminating.

The fourth chapter brings further proofs of the continuity and survival of Baroque style and theory in the poetical dictionaries of J. C. Mannling or J. G. Hamann (p. 89) and others.

In the second part of the book Dr Kettler discusses the influence of three seventeenth-century writers (H. A. von Ziegler, C. von Lohenstein, Opitz) on the eighteenth century, and here the chapter on H. A. von Ziegler's *Asiatische Banise* in particular presents a model for literary research. The union of courtly-idealistic and popular-realistic elements [(p. 104), cf. also Ziegler's imitators: F. Erdmann von Glaubitz, Palmenes, J. E. Eberhard, Fidelinus, Hamann] is justly singled out as the cause of Ziegler's popularity. The author points to Ziegler's description of the physiological effects of passion, his character painting in chiaroscuro, the stoicism of the heroine, etc. The significance of C. von Lohenstein's *Arminius* and the revival of Opitz are fully appreciated. One would perhaps have welcomed a wider bibliography with reference to the so-called 'Petrarchism' and to the *Sprachgesellschaften*.

The author presents his ideas with clarity and precision. His scholarly exactitude is indeed commendable, and this first work from his pen deserves full praise. A few delightful illustrations embellish the volume which has been produced with care despite the difficult times.

Goethe's '*Iphigenie auf Tauris*'. *An Interpretation and Critical Analysis*. By JAMES BOYD. Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. 176 pp. 12s. 6d.

Iphigenie is deceptively easy reading. All is well provided we do not probe too deeply. Yet as soon as we get down to details, of text and of theme, perplexities abound which have been the cause of much dispute. Professor Boyd's first objective has been to find out the meaning of the text itself at every stage, as the necessary preliminary to further discussion. He goes straight to Goethe's own words, without allowing the commentators to stand in his way; representative views of other scholars are given separately—and liberally—in the notes at the end, and there are some remarkable confrontations of opinion! Current interpretations are where necessary corrected. The author's second task has been to subject the play to a piercing scrutiny from the standpoint of structure, characterization and *Weltanschauung*, and to attempt where possible to resolve ambiguities and discrepancies. The conflicts of critics are again displayed.

Professor Boyd takes the play scene by scene, after a general introduction which discusses the problem involved in the modernization of a Greek theme and touches upon the biographical background and sources. His judgements are balanced, and where he differs from predecessors it is generally to Goethe's advantage that he does so, showing the poet to have been a more careful play constructor than some have supposed who have adhered to the genetic approach to the play. Professor Boyd does not expressly set out to study *Iphigenie* against the whole background of the *Goethezeit*, it is his merit that he makes it easier for his readers to do so fruitfully.

Iphigenie's Weltschmerz has much in common with Werther's and that of the other *Sturm und Drang* personalities. She feels as acutely as any the difficulty of preserving a pure soul amid all the tribulations and evils of this world. Her reliance upon her heart as the supreme guide of action is in keeping with contemporary literary beliefs as well as with the philosophical—and Faustian!—recognition of man's limited capacity for perceiving truth. Professor Boyd rightly draws attention to this as 'the essence of Goethe's problem' (p. 12). Accordingly it is required that the gods must be held to be benevolent, or all effort is futile and all life doomed to end in hopeless tragedy. *Iphigenie's* identification of the heart with the voice of the gods is in line with Herder's statement that man creates God in his own image. And the gods justify her faith in their goodness. So it comes about that *Iphigenie* can submit herself to them all along the line. Her faith may be shaken momentarily; like Faust she errs, but error is a means of attaining to the light, the evils of life are but the *Kehrseite des Guten*. Man must co-operate with the gods by exercising, untiringly and without counting the cost, those god-given qualities of *Humanität*—which are the possession of Thoas as well as of the Greeks. This is the doctrine of Faustian striving and the *Liebe von oben* that it wins, set out in subdued, if no less definite, harmonies. *Iphigenie's* determination to retain 'das Bild in ihrer Seele' is of the same order as Faust's refusal to give way to the *Faulbett* and the *Schönheit des Augenblicks*. It is all that she—and he—can do amid the perplexities of life; it is instinctive, and it is supremely right.

Professor Boyd's suggestive criticism calls forth such conclusions as these. It has given to English Goethe scholarship something that has so far been done in similar measure only for *Faust*. The latter's more obvious complexities as well as its dominating position have caused it to monopolize attention. The present book shows how much need there is of equally searching examinations of Goethe's other works. Their problems are none the less difficult, even though they may not be so immediately apparent. Professor Boyd has ably shown the way.

A. GILLIES

HULL

Goethe's Urfaust and Faust, ein Fragment. Edited by L. A. WILLOUGHBY. Oxford: Blackwell. 1943. xlv+298 pp. 10s. 6d.

Scholarship can make a shining virtue of present necessity. It is good that circumstance has emphasized the need we had for this first adequate critical edition of either text; better still that the preparation has been in hands so expert at managing vast and complex research. Professor Willoughby claims 'to have done no more than skim the surface'. But it is not on the surface that such pearls are found.

The edition is a masterly study in the history of composition. The extensive note on language and metre, with frequent reference to the norm of Adelung, will prove a more practical guide to changes of language and style than the student readily finds in any other *Faust* commentary. The arrangement goes far to satisfy a long-felt need; presentation on opposite pages is the only effective aid to comparison, and the 'gaps' of which the student must learn are filled in before his eyes instead of being noted in summary sequence. Confusion may arise through the complex system of numerical references, and search for lines may be misled, since the only sign by which the uninitiated may distinguish the texts is the page-title; but this could be countered only by costly typographical device. Criticism may also be made because most undergraduates, concerned with the final form of the drama, use an annotated *Faust I* and will be confused by three sets of numbers and notes. A desirable alternative of numbering to correspond to *Faust I* would be difficult in view of sections of the *Urfaust* ultimately discarded. But any technical device for bringing this text into closer contact with *Faust I* would be welcome; for one of its chief merits is that it supplements and revises the annotations of other recognized commentators of the final version. It is refreshing to find plausible emphasis on the case of Margarete Brandt, and the editor's most sensitive insight into Goethe's transformation of it strikes a human note in careful scholarship. Similarly, though much is often said about Herder's influence on Goethe and about the poetical quality of *Faust*, it is illuminating to find these two things so effectively correlated. The editor reveals with precision the psychological and dramatic significance of the songs of Gretchen, so that the *Urfaust* stands as contemporary illustration of Herder's creed.

In comparison with Gretchen, Mephistopheles suffers a little in the Introduction through lack of clear definition. The statement (pp. xxi, xxii: 'in the transition from *Urfaust* to *Fragment* this reference to his origin was deliberately omitted') might lose significance if confronted by *Fragment* 528, which shows immaterial alteration of *Urfaust* 443; common to both versions, 'meiner Muhme der Schlange' is a clear reference to Mephisto's origin. Moreover, if the difference between Mephisto in *Urfaust* and *Fragment* is the transition from 'a devil' to 'the devil', I am not sure that it is a grammatical quibble to point to *Urfaust* 662, identical with *Fragment* 1273 ('kein Teufel', which, had Goethe wished, could have read 'nicht selbst der Teufel'), to *Urfaust* 713 and *Fragment* 1322, to *Urfaust* 404, or even to those lines in which Goethe so deftly compromises with rationalism for the legend of the escape on the wine-vat. (*Urfaust* alone has 'Es war der Teufel selbst' 199: it would not be altogether natural to refer this to Faust, for with similar intuition to that of Gretchen in *Urfaust* 605, Brander senses—in *vino veritatem*—the late presence of the Evil One.) I think we have from these lines a sharper foretaste of the Witch's Kitchen than Professor Willoughby would allow. But argument on Mephisto seems fated to be inconclusive, since, as 'Geist des Widerspruchs' long before the phrase was coined, he remains 'gleich geheimnisvoll für Kluge wie für Toren'.

A little detail (as it happens, not far out of context) illustrates the characteristic sanity of the present edition. The note on the 'Hexeneinmaleins' indicates the magic circle as origin: 'Of the many attempts made to solve this numerical puzzle that of F. Maack . . . is as good as any.' In the year following Maack's *Talisman Turc*

there appeared in second edition a complex cabbalistic gloss, which claimed that 'die judische Metaphysik und der Spinozismus. . . wurden für den Dichter die Leit-motive zum Aufbau seines Faust'. The title of this monograph by Gustav Siebert was *Das Hexeneinmaleins der Schlüssel zu Goethes Faust*. That sort of thing is avoided in the present edition, because Professor Willoughby has achieved and preserved a balance of judgement in the midst of great learning.

W. F. MAINLAND

LONDON

What Nietzsche means. By G. A. MORGAN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. 408 pp. 22s. 6d.

'Can anything be good which attracts so many flies?' (p. 3). Thus briskly does the author of this readable and reliable book address himself to a re-examination of 'the popular Nietzsche myth' by presenting the German's thought as fully and fairly as possible, preferring quotation to comment and resisting the temptation to propound special views of his own. The book is sound in method and thorough in investigation. Its excellent translations, indices, bibliographical references, no less than the patience and charity of presentation are characteristic of the best American scholarship. It is a pity that these four hundred interesting pages should be relegated to libraries, since their price is well beyond the average student's purse.

As Professor Morgan well says: 'Nietzsche does not require translation into the present, he speaks directly within it, so much are his problems our problems and his predicament our own' (p. 4). After a sketch of Nietzsche's manner as a writer and thinker, stressing his 'habit of cutting under the obvious', the central sections deal with psychology, the concept of power, the views on modern morals and on art. This last, and the chapter on history, are perhaps the most illuminating for the ordinary student. Professor Morgan does not evade the difficulties, as he remarks, 'it is difficult to be sure when Nietzsche is describing and when he is prescribing' (p. 193, n.). Yet such difficulties as these are not solved by stating them, and the reader should realize that this book will take him only a short way along the road of understanding Nietzsche. This is a commentary only in so far as one passage of an author may explain another. On the outstandingly difficult points, such as the superman, eternal recurrence or master morality, one misses the penetration of such an interpreter as Jaspers. On the other hand the originality and brilliance of Nietzsche's writing emerge more clearly from this clear and general account than from most attempts at interpretation.

It is time that British students studied Nietzsche more seriously. 'Considering his wretched health and lack of scientific training, one can only admire his insight into the trends of recent physics' (p. 271). Yet the same insight is impressive in quite different fields, in art, in history, in his views of German culture after 1870, even in literary criticism: 'Our historians of literature are tedious because they force themselves to speak about everything, and to judge even where they have experienced nothing' (p. 320). Many who talk of Nietzsche's worship of power and his connexion with National Socialism would do well to read in this book such passages as the following (p. 125). 'The Germans imagine that power (*Kraft*) must reveal itself in harshness and cruelty, then they submit gladly and with admiration. ^{But} there is power in gentleness and quietness they do not easily believe. They ^{find} power in Goethe and imagine that Beethoven has more; and in that they are ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{right} ^{ken}.'

W. G. MOORE

OXFORD

SHORT NOTICES

The 1941 issue of *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, edited by Hardin Craig (Stanford University, California. vi+387 pp.), opens with 'a brief meditation' (as its writer Albert Guérard calls it) on 'The Growth of the Historical Spirit', which is fine in conception and precisely controlled in expression. Even in the brief prelude, where it is maintained that 'there is no liberty but in the realm of accurate definitions', there are seminal ideas. The discussion itself leads brilliantly to its two main conclusions:

The first is that the growth of the historical spirit may be likened, not to a melody, but to a fugue. The same theme—the reality of change—is picked up by various instruments and in various keys. At times, theological controversy is the leader; then philosophy, then art, then history proper, philosophy again, art once more, the natural sciences. The development of that essential thought ignores all departmental fences. . . . The second proposition is that, of all the manifestations of the historical spirit, the most obvious are also the most superficial.

The whole article, a defence of 'the discussion of ideas as . . . the central and essential . . . method in the study of literature', illuminates all the subjects upon which it briefly touches.

Some illustration of the method in practice is found in this very volume: Kurt F. Reinhardt's article on Baroque culture, its relation to political conditions and its development as a means of religious restatement. The account of the developments in stagecraft associated with Baroque religious drama is particularly interesting.

Here may be mentioned too Lu Emily Pearson's delightful article on Elizabethan widows.

This collection of studies is as a whole marked by clear and firm treatment of topics worth the time expended in their study. Notable amongst them are Arthur G. Kennedy's 'Odium Philologicum, or, A Century of Progress in English Philology', which both brings to life and pays tribute to some of the pioneers to whom that progress (1834–1934) is due, and Herbert Merritt's discussion of 'Some Minor Ways of Word-Formation in Old English'.

Mention must be made of three factual contributions: 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel des Pechiez*', by Charlton G. Laird, 'Jaggard's Catalogue of English Books', by Oliver M. Willard, and 'Three Articles from the Pen of Charles Kingsley', by Ruth Estelle Matthews.

W. M. T. DODDS

LONDON

The nineteenth volume of the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, *Essays by Divers Hands*, has been edited by Dr R. W. Chapman (London: Oxford University Press. 1942. viii+156 pp. 7s. 6d.). Three of the seven lectures it contains are biographical. We are glad to have Mr R. W. Ramsay's account of 'Sir George Wheler and his Travels in Greece, 1650–1724', and Professor Edith Morley's of 'John Cunningham, 1729–75', actor and minor poet, whose love of nature and fresh observation of it deserve to be recalled to mind; more welcome still is Mr Edmund Blunden's study of 'Leigh Hunt's Eldest Son' Thornton, with his 'almost superhuman respect for truth', friend in his childhood of Lamb and Shelley, and later days of many of the great Victorians. Mr Michael Oakley writes of 'A Boy's Outlook on the Place of Poetry in the Lives of the Young'—a most suggestive paper, with a plea for a more inspiring teaching of poetry in schools. It would, I suspect, be difficult to find a sufficiency of masters with the ideal qualification he demands, but I doubt whether the average to-day is as far below it as he would have us believe. Mr Ivor Brown discusses 'The Difficulties of Dramatic Criticism',

showing how different the play on the stage may be from the author's intention. Professor R. H. Mottram, in 'Let Us Persist', considers 'the dissemination of literature in English throughout the world', its causes and the importance it may have after the war. Finally, 'the veteran' Dr F. S. Boas (βοῶν ἀγαθός, as Dr Chapman calls him in his Introduction) traces 'The Soldier in Elizabethan and later English Drama', showing once more how he continues 'unchanged in essentials' through the centuries.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS

LONDON

Miss Jean Robertson's *The Art of Letter Writing* (London: Hodder and Stoughton; Liverpool: University Press. 1942. 80 pp. 7s. 6d.) traces the history of English guides to letter-writing from their beginnings to well into the eighteenth century, through epochs which might be described as the Latin rhetorical, the English familiar, and the French courteous, ending in the English practical and bourgeois. It is an entertaining study, not without importance. It illustrates, for example, the overriding mastery of the classical art of rhetoric in the sixteenth century in England. And we may trace the bearing of printed letter-writing upon fiction from Breton to Richardson, though Miss Robertson does not relate this aspect of the matter to Lyly or Sidney, for example. Breton certainly was an experimenter in this direction. One would have been glad to have some indication of the trend of professional guides to letter-writing in relation to actual surviving letters. And there was room for a good deal more of bibliographical information in respect of some of the books mentioned. It is to be noted, incidentally, that a number of these were only accessible to Miss Robertson in the Huntington Library, where much of her work was done, as is clear from the valuable bibliography which forms an appendix to her book. A colon in the first paragraph of p. 13 surely should be a full stop, and elsewhere there is some doubt about the punctuation and sequence of thought. It is a pleasant book, deserving of close attention, and of a binding more in keeping with the paper, printing, and contents.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

Discussion of the authorship of *The Canadian Boat-Song* has often ignored the most important evidence, that of style and feeling. It is, as Professor G. H. Needler says in *The Lone Shieling* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. ix+109 pp. 8s. 6d.), 'foolish to be positive in maintaining that this or that poet *could not* have written such and such a poem' (p. 50), but one may go further than his cautious '*very unlikely*' as regards all but one of those who have been put forward as the author of the *Boat-Song*. The metrical evidence adduced in the first part of this study—the repeated use in acknowledged poems of the accentual sapphic rhythm by D. M. Moir ('Delta') alone of the candidates—is supported in the second part by evidence of the close relations between Moir and Galt when Galt was opening up the Huron Tract, and by parallels in thought and language in Moir's other work. Professor Needler's little book ought to make further controversy unnecessary.

E.-C. BATHO

LONDON

The Raven and Other Poems, by Edgar Allan Poe, has been reproduced in facsimile from the Lorimer Graham copy of the edition of 1845 with Author's Corrections, with an Introduction by Thomas Ollive Mabbott (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphry Milford. 1942. xviii+92 pp. 12s.). This is no. 56 of the publications of the Facsimile Text Society, completing the series of Poe's four

volumes of verse, and it is of interest to all students of Poe's text and of the history of his poems. The raven, there is no doubt of it, was a Raven: Poe would not allow the lower case for its name. Changes made in the text both here and in other poems show his care for sound, e.g. *not a minute stopped or stayed he* for the earlier too sibilant *not an instant*, and *all my fancy into smiling* for *all my sad soul into smiting*. It remains false poetry. Mr Mabbott's Introduction and Digressions deal principally with historical and bibliographical problems and include some new information.

E. C. BATHO

LONDON

A plain text edition of *Gl' Ingannati* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1943. 92 pp. 3s. 6d.) is No. 1 of a series of *Italian Texts for Students of English Literature* privately printed for the Department of English and Italian of the University of Edinburgh. The Preface gives the necessary information on the comedy itself, and on its relations to English literature, with a short Bibliography or Reading List. It appears from the initials which sign the Preface that we owe this edition of *Gl' Ingannati* to Mr John Purves.

One would have welcomed for the use of students of English some further information, e.g. on the conditions of production, or on the Academies. But the general intention of the series is admirable, and it is good to see at work such practical and living co-operation between two departments of humane studies. Subsequent volumes in the series will be looked forward to with great interest. I understand that the books are available for general purchase.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

This admirable book (*The Teacher of Nations. Addresses and Essays in Commemoration of the visit to England of the great Czech Educationalist Comenius, 1641*. Edited by Joseph Needham. Cambridge: University Press. 1942. 99 pp. 5s.) gives in short and readable form, for a most reasonable price, much information about Comenius and some valuable suggestions regarding his work and influence. The bulk of the material was delivered in the form of addresses at the commemoration meeting in the Cambridge Senate House on 24 October 1941. The choice of contributors seems to have been most happy; no chapter is dull, and in the work of the Czech scholars there is passion as well as insight. Outstanding perhaps are Professor Odložilik's pages on the historical setting of Comenius's career, J. L. Paton's racy illustrations of his educational methods, and Professor Bernal's fascinating essay singling out as Comenius's greatest contribution 'the discovery that education must proceed from an understanding of the needs and interest of pupils and that it must be based on the experience of life which children actually have' (p. 29). The matter, no less than the spirit, of this volume is best expressed in the short page contributed by the President of Harvard: 'The spirit of Comenius should make possible in every generation that fresh envisaging of educational problems which he, against overwhelming odds, forced upon his contemporaries' (p. 40). By way of illustration of this, the most interesting essay in the book is on the experiments made in Cambridgeshire towards rural community centres. Mr Morris is in the direct tradition of Comenius when he lashes 'the blindness that does not see that health and education are the chief instruments of racial preservation', and in urging upon the public authority 'the provision of every facility that science and art can devise for the constructive use of leisure time' (pp. 24, 25).

W. G. MOORE

LONDON

NEW PUBLICATIONS

April—June 1943

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON

GENERAL

BROWN, A. C. L., *The Origin of the Grail Legend*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$5.00.

CARNAP, R., *Introduction to Semantics*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Italian.

CIOFFARI, V., *The Conception of Fortune and Fate in the Works of Dante*. Cambridge, Mass., Dante Society; London, H. Milford. 4s. 6d.

Gl' *Ingannati*, ed. by J. Purves. Edinburgh and London, Oliver and Boyd. 3s. 6d.

Spanish.

Hispanic American Essays. A Memorial to J. A. Robertson, ed. by A. C. Wilgus. Chapel Hill, Univ. of N. Carolina Press. 30s.

French.

CORNELL, W. K., *Adolphe Retté*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

GILMAN, M., *Baudelaire the Critic*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.

LANCASTER, H. C., *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century. Part V: Recapitulation, 1610–1700*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 30s.

Maistre Pierre Pathelin as edited by R. T. Holbrook. Oxford, Blackwell. 5s.

Marcel Proust: Reviews and Estimates in English, compiled by G. D. Lindner. Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s. 6d.

SAINTONGE, P., and R. W. CHRIST, *Fifty Years of Molière Studies. A Bibliography, 1892–1941*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s. 6d.

WADSWORTH, P. A., *The Novels of Gomberville*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.

Provençal.

STRONSKI, S., *La poésie et la réalité aux temps des troubadours* (Taylorian Lecture. 1943). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Scandinavian.

The Life of Gudmund the Good, Bishop of Holar, trans. by G. Turville-Petre and E. S. Olszewska. London, Viking Society. 6s.

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*.

DILTZ, B. C., *Poetic Pilgrimage. An Essay in Education*. Toronto, Clarke, Irwin; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.

ENTWISTLE, W. J., and E. GILLET, *The Literature of England, 500–1942*. London, Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. xxviii. 1942. Collected by R. W. Chapman. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

ONIONS, C. T., *The Fate of French -é in English. The Plural of Nouns ending in -th*. (S.P.E. Tract LXI.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.

- Proceedings of the British Academy, 1940. Oxford Univ. Press for the British Academy. .30s.
- REANEY, P. H., *The Place Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely* (E.P.-N.S. XIX). Cambridge Univ. Press. 23s. 6d.
- Studies in English, 1942.* Austin, Univ. of Texas. \$1.00.
- (b) *Old and Middle English.*
- Book of Virtues and Vices, The, A Fourteenth Century Translation of the 'Somme le Roi' of Lorens d'Orléans, ed. by W. N. Francis (E.E.T.S. 217). London, H. Milford. 52s. 6d.
- MOORE, G. E., *The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor.* [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- (c) *Modern English.*
- ALSPACH, R. K., *A Consideration of the Poets of the Literary Revival in Ireland, 1889-1929.* [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- BAKELESS, J., *The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe.* Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 2 vols. 42s.
- BENNETT, J. W., *The Evolution of 'The Faerie Queene'.* Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 18s.
- BHATTACHERJE, M. M., 'Courtesy' in Shakespeare. Univ. of Calcutta.
- BIRKENHEAD, S., *Against Oblivion. The Life of Joseph Severn.* London, Cassell. 12s. 6d.
- CECIL, LORD DAVID, *Hardy, the Novelist.* London, Constable. 7s. 6d.
- CLARKSON, P. S., and T. W. CLYDE, *The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama.* Johns Hopkins Press; London, H. Milford. 21s. 6d.
- DENNIS, J., *The Critical Works of, ed. by E. N. Hooker. Vol. II. 1711-1729.* Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s. 6d.
- DRYDEN, J., *The Letters of, ed. by C. E. Ward.* Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press. \$3.00.
- FAIRCHILD, H. N., *Religious Trends in English Poetry. Vol. II. 1740-1780. Religious Sentimentalism in the Age of Johnson.* Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 33s. 6d.
- HALLAM, A., *The Writings of, ed. by T. H. Vail Motter.* New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, Oxford Univ. Press. \$3.50.
- IZARD, T. C., *George Whetstone.* Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s.
- KOSTER, D. N., *The Theme of Divorce in American Drama, 1871-1939.* [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- MOORE, J. R., *Defoe's Sources for 'Robert Drury's Journal'.* Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Bookstore. 75c.
- MOSSNER, E. C., *The Forgotten Hume.* Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.
- SHEPPERSON, A. B., *John Paradise and Lucy Ludwell of London and Williamsburg.* Richmond, Virginia; The Dietz Press. \$4.00.
- SHUMAKER, E. J., *A concise Bibliography of the Complete Works of Richard H. Horne (1802-1884).* Granville, Ohio.
- WILLCOCKS, M. P., *Bunyan Calling. A Voice from the Seventeenth Century.* London, Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.
- Wordsworth's Pocket Notebook, ed. by G. H. Healey.* Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s. 6d.